

Hypothesis Formalization: Empirical Findings, Software Limitations, and Design Implications

EUNICE JUN, University of Washington, USA

MELISSA BIRCHFIELD, University of Washington, USA

NICOLE DE MOURA, Eastlake High School, USA

JEFFREY HEER, University of Washington, USA

RENÉ JUST, University of Washington, USA

Data analysis requires translating higher level questions and hypotheses into computable statistical models. We present a mixed-methods study aimed at identifying the steps, considerations, and challenges involved in operationalizing hypotheses into statistical models, a process we refer to as *hypothesis formalization*. In a content analysis of research papers, we find that researchers highlight decomposing a hypothesis into sub-hypotheses, selecting proxy variables, and formulating statistical models based on data collection design as key steps. In a lab study, we find that analysts fixated on implementation and shaped their analysis to fit familiar approaches, even if sub-optimal. In an analysis of software tools, we find that tools provide inconsistent, low-level abstractions that may limit the statistical models analysts use to formalize hypotheses. Based on these observations, we characterize hypothesis formalization as a dual-search process balancing conceptual and statistical considerations constrained by data and computation, and discuss implications for future tools.

ACM Reference Format:

Eunice Jun, Melissa Birchfield, Nicole de Moura, Jeffrey Heer, and René Just. 2021. Hypothesis Formalization: Empirical Findings, Software Limitations, and Design Implications. 1, 1 (December 2021), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Using statistics to answer real-world questions requires four steps: (i) translating high-level, domain-specific questions and hypotheses into specific statistical questions [17]; (ii) identifying statistical models to answer the statistical questions; (iii) implementing and executing these statistical models, typically with the help of software tools; and (iv) interpreting the results, considering the domain-specific questions and applying analytical reasoning.

For example, suppose a census researcher asked, “In the United States (U.S.), how does an individual’s sex relate to their annual income?” Drawing upon their prior experiences and exploratory data visualizations, the researcher knows that income in the U.S. is skewed, and they want to know how the distributions of income among males and females differ (step i). However, before implementing, they (implicitly) define their causal model: The researcher knows that other factors, such as education and race, may be associated with employment opportunities, which may then influence

Authors’ addresses: Eunice Jun, emjun@cs.washington.edu, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA; Melissa Birchfield, mbirch2@cs.washington.edu, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA; Nicole de Moura, nicolede Moura4@gmail.com, Eastlake High School, Sammamish, Washington, USA; Jeffrey Heer, jheer@cs.washington.edu, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA; René Just, rjust@cs.washington.edu, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM




Fig. 1. Definition and overview of the hypothesis formalization steps and process.

Hypothesis formalization is a dual-search process of translating a **conceptual hypothesis** into a statistical **model implementation**. Blue indicates steps and transitions that we identified. Black indicates steps and transitions discussed in prior work. “Mathematical Equation” (dashed box) was rarely an explicit step in our lab study but evident in our content analysis. Our findings (blue arrows) subsume several of the transitions identified in prior work. When they do not, prior work’s transitions are included in black. Hypothesis formalization is a non-linear process. Analysts iterate over conceptual steps to refine their hypothesis in a *hypothesis refinement loop*. Analysts also iterate over computational and implementation steps in a *model implementation loop*. Data collection and data properties may also prompt conceptual revisions and influence statistical model implementation. As analysts move toward model implementation, they increasingly rely on software tools, gain specificity, and create intermediate artifacts along the way (e.g., causal models, observations about data, etc.).

income. As such, they refine their conceptual hypothesis to consider the possible effects of race, education, sex, and their interactions on income. They plan to fit a generalized linear model with race, education, sex, and their two-way interactions as predictors of income (step ii). They start implementing a script to load and model data (step iii). The researcher receives a small table of results and is surprised to receive a convergence warning. After further investigation, they simplify their model and remove the interaction effects to see how that may affect convergence (revise step iii). This time, their model converges, and they interpret the results (step iv), but they really want to study how sex and race interact, so they return to implementation (step iii) and proceed as before, iteratively removing and adding effects and changing computational parameters, and as a by-product shifting which high-level conceptual hypothesis is reflected in the model.

Performing statistical data analysis goes well beyond invoking the correct statistical functions in a software library. Analysts, such as the census researcher, must go back and forth between conceptual hypothesis and model implementation realities, grappling with domain knowledge, limitations of data, and statistical methods.

We refer to the process of translating a conceptual hypothesis into a computable statistical model as *hypothesis formalization*. This process is messy and under-scrutinized, and consequently we investigate the steps, considerations, challenges, and tools involved. Based on our findings, we define hypothesis formalization as a dual-search process [47] that involves developing and integrating cognitive representations from two different perspectives—conceptual hypotheses

and concrete model implementations. Analysts move back and forth between these two perspectives during formalization while balancing conceptual, data-driven, statistical, and implementation constraints. Figure 1 summarizes our definition and findings. Specifically, the paper addresses the following questions:

- **RQ1 - Steps:** What is the range of steps an analyst might consider when formalizing a hypothesis? How do these steps compare to ones that we might expect based on prior work?
- **RQ2 - Process:** How do analysts think about and perform the steps to translate their hypotheses into model implementations? What challenges do they face during this process?
- **RQ3 - Tools:** How might current software tools influence hypothesis formalization?

To develop a broad understanding of the steps (**RQ1 - Steps**) and considerations (**RQ2 - Process**) involved in hypothesis formalization, we first conducted a content analysis of 50 randomly sampled research papers across five different domains. We find that researchers decompose their research hypotheses into specific sub-hypotheses, derive proxy variables from theory and available data, and adapt statistical analyses to account for data collection procedures.

To validate and deepen our understanding of hypothesis formalization (**RQ1 - Steps** and **RQ2 - Process**), we designed and conducted a lab study in which we observed 24 analysts develop and formalize hypotheses in-situ. We find that analysts foreground implementation concerns, even when brainstorming hypotheses, and try to fit their hypotheses and analyses to prior experiences and familiar tools, suggesting a strong influence of tools (**RQ3 - Tools**).

To identify how tools may shape hypothesis formalization (**RQ3 - Tools**), we reviewed 20 statistical software tools. We find that although the tools support nuanced model implementations, their low-level abstractions can focus analysts on statistical and computational details at the expense of higher-level reasoning about initial hypotheses. Tools also do not aid analysts in identifying reasonable model implementations that would test their conceptual hypotheses, which may explain why analysts in our lab study relied on familiar approaches, even if sub-optimal.

Our content analysis, lab study, and tools analysis inform one another and suggest **three design implications** for tools to more directly support hypothesis formalization: (i) connect statistical model implementations to their mathematical representations, (ii) provide higher-level abstractions for expressing conceptual hypotheses and partial model specifications, and (iii) develop bidirectional computational assistance for authoring causal models and relating them to statistical models.

By defining and characterizing hypothesis formalization, we aim to advance the discourse around data analysis, more precisely understand how people conduct data analysis, reveal opportunities for more transparent and reproducible analyses, and inform future tools that support end-users in their analysis processes.

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

Our work integrates and builds upon prior research on frameworks of scientific discovery, theories of sensemaking, statistical practices, and empirical studies of data analysts.

2.1 Dual-search Model of Scientific Discovery

Klahr and Simon characterized scientific discovery as a dual-search process involving the development and evaluation of hypotheses and experiments [47]. They posited that scientific discovery involved tasks specific to hypotheses (e.g., revising hypotheses) and to experiments (e.g., analyzing data collected from experiments), which they separated into two different “spaces,” and tasks moving between them, which is where we place hypothesis formalization.

Extending Klahr and Simon’s two-space model, Schunn and Klahr proposed a more granular four-space model involving data representation, hypothesis, paradigm, and experiment spaces [73, 74]. In the four-space model, conceptual




Fig. 2. Relationship between hypothesis formalization and prior work.

Left: Schunn and Klahr’s four-space model of scientific discovery (stylized adaptation from Figure 1 in [73]), which includes unidirectional information flow from the hypothesis space to the paradigm space (which includes model implementation). Hypothesis formalization (A) is focused on a tighter integration and the information flow between hypothesis and paradigm spaces. Specifically, the information flow is bidirectional in hypothesis formalization. Our content analysis (B) and lab study (C) triangulate the four-space model to understand hypothesis formalization from complementary perspectives. *Right:* Hypothesis formalization steps also identified in prior work on theories of sensemaking, statistical thinking, and data analysis workflows (citations included to the right of the arrows). Hypothesis formalization is finer grained and involves more iterations. While prior work broadly refers to mathematical equations, partial model specifications, and computationally tuned model implementations as statistical specifications, hypothesis formalization differentiates them. This paper provides empirical evidence for theorized loops between conceptual hypothesis and statistical specification (see Figure 1).

hypothesizing still lies in the hypothesis space, and hypothesis testing and statistical modeling lies in the paradigm space. As such, hypothesis formalization is a process connecting the hypothesis and paradigm spaces. In Schunn and Klahr’s four-space model, information flows unidirectionally from the hypothesis space to the paradigm space. Here we extend this prior research with evidence that hypothesis formalization involves both concept-to-implementation and implementation-to-concept processes. (see Figure 1). Figure 2 augments Schunn and Klahr’s original diagram (Figure 1 in [73]) with annotations depicting how our content analysis of research papers and lab study triangulate a tighter dual-space search between hypothesis and paradigm spaces with a focus on hypothesis formalization. Our mixed-methods approach follows the precedent and recommendations of Klahr and Simon’s [48] study of scientific discovery activities.

2.2 Theories of Sensemaking

Human beings engage in *sensemaking* to acquire new knowledge. Several theories of sensemaking [49, 68, 71] describe how and when human beings seek and integrate new data (e.g., observations, experiences, etc.) to develop their mental models about the world.

Russell et al. [71] emphasize the importance of building up and evaluating external representations of mental models, and define sensemaking as “the process of searching for a representation and encoding data in that representation to answer task-specific questions.” External representations are critical because they influence the quality of conclusions reached at the end of the sensemaking process and affect how much time and effort is required in the process. Some representations may lead to insights more quickly. Russell et al. describe the iterative process of searching for and refining external representations in a “learning loop complex” that involves transitioning back and forth between (i) searching for and (ii) instantiating representations.

Grolemund and Wickham argued for statistical data analysis as a sensemaking activity [31]. They emphasize the (1) bidirectional nature of updating mental models of the world and hypotheses based on data and collecting data based on hypotheses and (2) the process of identifying and reconciling discrepancies between hypotheses and data. Their depiction of the analysis process parallels Klahr and Simon’s framework of scientific discovery.

In this paper, we consider hypothesis formalization to be a learning loop [71] where the conceptual hypothesis is an external representation of a set of assumptions analysts may have about the world (e.g., an implicit causal model), that ultimately affects which models are specified and which results are obtained. We found that there are smaller learning loops as analysts search for and revise intermediate representations, such as explicit causal models, mathematical equations, or partially specified models. The hypothesis and model refinement loops can themselves be smaller learning loops embedded in the larger loop of hypothesis formalization.

2.3 Statistical Thinking

Statistical thinking and practice require differentiating between *domain* and *statistical* questions. The American Statistical Association (ASA), a professional body representing statisticians, recommends that universities teach this fundamental principle in introductory courses (see Goal 2 in [17]).

Similarly, researchers Wild and Pfannkuch emphasize the importance of differentiating between and integrating statistical knowledge and context (or domain) knowledge when thinking statistically [65, 66, 87]. They propose a four step model for operationalizing ideas (“inklings”) into plans for collecting data, which are eventually statistically analyzed. In their model, analysts must transform “inklings” into broad questions and then into precise questions that are then finally turned into a plan for data collection (see Figure 2 in [87]). Statistical and domain knowledge inform all four stages. However, it is unknown what kinds of statistical and domain knowledge are helpful, how they are used and weighed against each other, and when certain kinds of knowledge are helpful to operationalize inkings. Our work provides more granular insight into Wild and Pfannkuch’s proposed model of operationalization and aims to answer when, how, and what kinds of statistical and domain knowledge are used during statistical data analysis.

More recently, in *Statistical Rethinking* [58], McElreath proposes that there are three key representational phases involved in data analysis: conceptual hypotheses, causal models underlying hypotheses (which McElreath calls “process models”), and statistical models. McElreath, like the ASA and Wild and Pfannkuch, separates domain and statistical ideas and discusses the use of causal models as an intermediate representation to connect the two. McElreath emphasizes that conceptual hypotheses may correspond to multiple causal and statistical models, and that the same statistical model may provide evidence for multiple, even contradictory, causal models and hypotheses. McElreath’s framework does not directly address how analysts navigate these relationships or how computation plays a role, both of which we take up in this paper.

Overall, our work provides empirical evidence for prior frameworks but also (i) provides more granular insight into *how* and *why* transitions between representations occur and (ii) scrutinizes the role of *software and computation* through close observation of analyst workflows in the lab as well as through a follow-up analysis of statistical software. Based on these observations, we also speculate on how tools might better support hypothesis formalization.

2.4 Empirical Studies of Data Analysts

Data analysis involves a number of tasks that involve data discovery, wrangling, profiling, modeling, and reporting [45]. Extending the findings of Kandel et al., both Alspaugh et al. [1] and Wongsuphasawat et al. [88] propose exploration as a distinct task. Whereas Wongsuphasawat et al. argue that exploration should subsume discovery and profiling, Alspaugh et al. describe exploration as an alternative to modeling. The importance of exploration and its role in updating analysts’ understanding of the data and their goals and hypotheses is of note, regardless of the precise order or set of tasks. Battle and Heer describe exploratory visual analysis (EVA), a subset of exploratory data analysis (EDA) where visualizations are the primary outputs and interfaces for exploring data, as encompassing both data-focused (bottom-up) and goal- or

hypothesis-focused (top-down) investigations [5]. In our lab study, we found that (i) analysts explored their data before modeling and (ii) exploratory observations sometimes prompted conceptual shifts in hypotheses (bottom-up) but at other times were guided by hypotheses and only impacted statistical analyses (top-down). In this way, data exploration appears to be an important intermediate step in hypothesis formalization, blurring the lines between exploratory and confirmatory data analysis.

Decisions throughout analysis tasks can give rise to a “garden of forking paths” [27], which compounds for meta-analyses synthesizing previous findings [44]. Liu, Boukhelifa, and Eagan [53] proposed a broad framework that characterizes analysis alternatives using three different *levels of abstraction*: cognitive, artifact, and execution. *Cognitive* alternatives involve more conceptual shifts and changes (e.g., mental models, hypotheses). *Artifact* alternatives pertain to tooling (e.g., which software is used for analysis?), model (e.g., what is the general mathematical approach?), and data choices (e.g., which dataset is used?). *Execution* alternatives are closely related to artifact alternatives but are more fine-grained programmatic decisions (e.g., hyperparameter tuning). We find that hypothesis formalization involves all three levels of abstraction. We provide a more granular depiction of how these levels cooperate with one another.

Moreover, Liu, Althoff, and Heer [54] identified numerous decision points throughout the data lifecycle, which they call *end-to-end analysis*. They found that analysts often revisit key decisions during data collection, wrangling, modeling, and evaluation. Liu, Althoff, and Heer also found that researchers executed and selectively reported analyses that were already found in prior work and familiar to the research community. Hypothesis formalization is comprised of a subset of steps involved in end-to-end analysis. Thus, we expect hypothesis formalization will be an iterative process where domain norms will influence decision making. It is nonetheless valuable to provide insight into how a single iteration — from a domain-specific research question to a single instantiation of a statistical model (among many alternatives which may be subsequently explored) — occurs. Our depiction of hypothesis formalization aims to account for more domain-general steps and artifacts, but we recognize that domain expertise and norms may determine which paths and how quickly analysts move through hypothesis formalization.

In summary, our work differs in (i) scope and (ii) method from prior work in HCI on data analysis practices. Whereas hypothesis formalization has remained implicit in prior descriptions of data analysis, we explicate this specific process. While previous researchers have relied primarily on post-analysis interviews with analysts, our lab study enables us to observe decision making during hypothesis formalization in-situ.

2.5 Expected Steps in Hypothesis Formalization

Towards our first research question (**RQ1 - Steps**), prior work suggests that hypothesis formalization involves steps in three categories: conceptual, data-based, and statistical. *Conceptually*, analysts develop conceptual hypotheses and causal models about their domain that guides their data analysis. With respect to *data*, analysts explore data and incorporate insights from exploration, which can be top-down or bottom-up, into their process of formalizing hypotheses. The *statistical* concerns analysts must address involve mathematical and computational concerns, such as identifying a statistical approach (e.g., linear modeling), representing the problem mathematically (e.g., writing out a linear model equation), and then implementing those using software. In our work, we find evidence to support separating statistical considerations into concerns about mathematics, statistical specification in tools, and model implementation using tools.

A key observation about prior work is that there is a tension between iterative and linear workflows during hypothesis formalization. Although sensemaking processes involve iteration, concerns about methodological soundness, as evidenced in pre-registration efforts that require researchers to specify and follow their steps without deviation, advocate for, or even impose, more linear processes. More specifically, theories of sensemaking that draw on cognitive science, in

particular [31, 71], propose larger iteration loops between conceptual and statistical considerations. Research concerning statistical thinking and practices [17, 87] appear less committed to iteration. Empirical work in HCI on data analysis embraces iteration during exploration and observes iteration during some phases of confirmatory data analysis, such as statistical model choice, but not in others, such as tool selection. In our work, we are sensitive to this tension and aim to provide more granular insight into iterations and linear processes involved in hypothesis formalization. We also anticipate that the steps identified in prior work will recur in our content analysis and lab study, but we do not limit our investigation to these steps.

3 CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH PAPERS

To identify what actions analysts take to formalize hypotheses (**RQ1 - Steps**) and why (**RQ2 - Process**), we examined 50 peer-reviewed publications. For breadth, we sourced the papers from five different domains.

3.1 Methods

Dataset: Our dataset consisted of 50 randomly sampled papers published in 2019, ten from each of following venues: (1) the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), (2) Nature, (3) Psychological Science (PS), (4) Journal of Financial Economics (JFE), and the (5) ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI). We sampled papers that used statistical analyses as either primary or secondary methodologies from these venues because they represent a plurality of domains and Google Scholar listed them among the top three in their respective areas in 2018.¹ We analyzed published papers because researchers are not only likely but required to report significant operationalization choices in their publications. Finally, we focused on papers published in 2019 to capture most recent practices.²

Analysis Approach: When coding and analyzing the papers, we were interested in learning about the breadth of steps involved in hypothesis formalization rather than assessing how well papers fit a predetermined set of steps. We also wanted to detect any co-occurrence or ordering among steps. Based on these considerations, the first two authors iteratively developed a codebook to code papers at the paragraph-level. The codebook contained five broad categories: (i) research goals, (ii) data sample information, (iii) statistical analysis, (iv) results reporting, and (v) computation. Each category had more specific codes to capture more nuanced differences between papers. For example, research goals could be statements or questions about something unknown, or focused examinations of possible associations between constructs, among other codes. This tiered coding scheme enabled us to see general content patterns across papers and nuanced steps within papers. The first two authors reached substantial agreement (IRR = .69 - .72) even before resolving disagreements. The first three authors then (i) read and coded all sections of papers except the figures, tables, and auxiliary materials;³ (ii) discussed and summarized the papers' goals and main findings to ensure comprehension and identify contribution types; and (iii) visualized and scrutinized each paper as a "reorderable matrix" [6]. Our supplementary materials include our codebook with definitions and examples and summaries, citations, and matrices for each paper.

3.2 Findings

We coded a total of 2,989 paragraphs across 50 papers. Results were the most commonly discussed topic. Approximately 31% of the paragraphs (in 50 papers) discussed interpretations of statistical results, and 11% (in 37 papers) provided

¹Venues were often clustered in the rankings without an obvious top-one, so we chose among the top three based on ease of access to publications (e.g., open access or access through our institution).

²Some papers were accepted and published before 2019, but the journals had included them in 2019 issues.

³PNAS and Nature papers included a materials and methods section after references that were distinct from extended tables, figures, and other auxiliary material. We coded the materials and methods sections.

details about statistical results (e.g., parameter estimates). Interpreted results often co-occurred with statistical results. 21% of paragraphs (in 40 papers) described data collection design (e.g., how the experiment was designed, how the data were collected, etc.). Specifications of statistical models appeared in 19% of paragraphs (in 50 papers). 11% of paragraphs (in 45 papers) discussed proxy variables, or measures to quantify abstract constructs (e.g., music enjoyment).

Researchers mentioned software used for statistical analysis in 3% of paragraphs (in 25 papers), sometimes even specifying function names and parameters, a level of detail we did not expect to find in publications. To our surprise, more papers mentioned software than included equations. Only fifteen papers (JFE: 9, PS: 5, PNAS: 1) included equations in a total of 71 paragraphs. This suggests that mathematical equations, though part of the hypothesis formalization process, are less important to researchers than their tool-specific implementations.

Papers published in PNAS and Nature had noticeably different structures than the CHI, JFE, and PS papers. The PNAS and Nature papers decoupled research goals, data sample properties, and results (in the main paper body) from data collection design and statistical analysis (in the appended materials and methods section). For individual studies in the CHI, JFE, and PS papers, codes repeated in noticeably linear patterns from research goals to data collection and sample information to proxy variables and statistical analyses to results. We also examined papers' contribution types, identifying those that presented empirical findings (41 papers), validated a prototype system (8 papers), or developed a new methodology (6 papers). We include a detailed description of paper contributions and venue differences in our supplementary material.

3.2.1 Researchers decompose hypotheses into sub-goals that correspond to statistical analyses. In approximately 70% of papers in the corpus, we found that researchers deconstructed their motivating research questions and overarching hypotheses into more tightly scoped objectives or relationships of interest that map to specific statistical analyses. For example, in [22], the researchers asked how theories of macroevolution varied across groups of species. The authors divided pre-existing hypotheses into three classes of hypotheses and assessed each class in turn. For one class of “geometric” hypotheses about insect egg size, the researchers discriminated between two opposing hypotheses by examining “the scaling exponent of length and width (the slope of the regression of log-transformed length and log-transformed width).” As this example demonstrates, hypothesis formalization involves an *iterative hypothesis refinement process at the conceptual level*. This refinement process distills hierarchies of hypotheses and/or a single conceptual hypothesis into sub-hypotheses and formalizes these sub-hypotheses in statistical model implementations. Researchers also relate sub-hypotheses to one other during this process, which implies their causal models about the motivating conceptual hypothesis (and domain).

3.2.2 Researchers concretize hypotheses using proxies that are based on theory or available data. Proxy variables further refine conceptual hypotheses by identifying how observable some concepts are, measuring the observable ones, indirectly measuring the less observable ones, and comparing measurement choices to other possible measures or ideal scenarios. As such, proxy variable selection is an important transition step between conceptual and data concerns during hypothesis formalization.

When defining proxy variables, researchers (i) used previously validated measures when available for theoretical and methodological soundness, such as the Barcelona Music Reward Questionnaire (BMRQ) to measure music reward (in [36]), or (ii) developed new measures as a research contribution. For example, in [26], the authors develop an EEG-based measure for “immersiveness” in VR they demonstrated to be superior to previous measures that required halting immersive VR experiences to ask users about immersion. Researchers also sometimes justified choosing proxies based on available data. For example, in [29], the researchers wanted to develop a proxy variable for job rank based on titles and

“financial outcomes” (e.g., compensation, bonuses, etc.) to see if housing bankers were promoted or demoted after the 2008 stock market crash. However, because the financial outcomes were not public, the researchers relied on title only to compare bankers’ ranks, which was sub-optimal because job titles differ between companies.

Researchers consider their proxy choices as study limitations and consider alternative proxies to ensure that their findings are robust. Validating findings with multiple proxies suggests that hypothesis formalization can be a *recursive process*. Proxies lead to follow-up hypotheses about possible latent measurement factors, for instance, which in turn lead to additional analyses that address the same conceptual hypothesis.

3.2.3 Data collection and sampling influence statistical analysis. Researchers often described their data sampling and study design as factors that necessitated additional steps in their analysis process. In [7] and [64], researchers accounted for effects of task order in their study protocol by running additional regressions or analyzing tasks separately. Researchers also ran initial analyses to assess the effect of possibly confounding variables in their study design, such as gender in [20] or location of stimuli in [83]. Other times, researchers performed robustness checks after their main analyses, such as in response to a gender imbalance in [64] and possible sample selection biases due to database constraints in [38].

Although data collection driven by statistical modeling plans was expected of replication studies (e.g., [7, 64, 89]) or papers that make methodological contributions (e.g., [15, 16]), we found an instance in [2]—neither replication nor methodological contribution—where researchers explicitly reported selecting a statistical model before designing their study. The researchers chose to use a well-validated computational model, the linear ballistic accumulator (LBA), to quantify aspects of human decision making. This model selection influenced the way they designed their study protocol so that they could obtain a sample large enough for accurate parameter estimation.

Based on these observations, it seems that modeling choices more frequently react to data collection processes and possible sample biases, following a linear data collection–first process implied by prior work. However, there are also instances where model implementation comes first and researchers’ data collection procedures must adhere to modeling needs, suggesting a previously missing *loop between statistical model implementation and data collection* that is separate from any influences conceptual hypotheses have on data collection.

3.3 Takeaways from the Content Analysis

The content analysis confirmed prior findings on (i) the connection between hypotheses and causal models, (ii) the importance of proxies to quantify concepts, and (iii) the constraints that data collection design and logistics place on modeling. Extending prior work, the content analysis also (i) suggested that decomposing hypotheses into specific objectives is a mechanism by which conceptual hypotheses relate to causal models; (ii) crystallized the hypothesis refinement loop involving conceptual hypotheses, causal models and proxies; and (iii) surfaced the dual-search nature of hypothesis formalization by suggesting that model implementation may shape data collection.

The content analysis also raised questions about how much the pressures to write compelling scientific narratives [46] influence which aspects of hypothesis formalization are described or omitted (e.g., in practice, model implementations may constrain data collection more often than we found in our dataset), how the steps are portrayed linearly even though the process may have been more iterative, how analysts determine which tools to use, and how analysts without domain expertise may approach hypothesis formalization differently. These questions motivated us to design and conduct a lab study to provide greater visibility into how analysts who are not necessarily researchers approach the process with expectations of rigor but without pressure of publication.

4 EXPLORATORY LAB STUDY

To understand analysts' considerations (**RQ2 - Process**) while formalizing their hypotheses (**RQ1 - Steps**), as well as the role of statistical software in this process (**RQ3 - Tools**), we designed and conducted a virtual lab study.

4.1 Methods

Analysts: We recruited 24 data analysts with experience in domains ranging from marketing to physics to education, through Upwork (22) and by word of mouth (2). Twelve analysts worked as scientists, freelance data scientists, project managers, or software engineers. Six were currently enrolled in or just finished graduate programs that involved data analysis. Five identified as current or recent undergraduates looking for jobs in data science. One was an educator. Analysts self-reported having significant experience on a 10-point scale adapted from [24] (min=2, max=10, mean=6.4, std=2.04) and would presumably have familiarity with hypothesis formalization.

Protocol: Based on our content analysis findings, we designed and conducted a lab study with three parts. We compensated analysts \$45 for their time. The first author conducted the study and took notes throughout. Parts 1 and 3 were recorded and automatically transcribed using Zoom.

Part 1: Structured Tasks. Part 1 asked analysts to imagine they were leading a research team to answer the following research question: "What aspects of an individual's background and demographics are associated with income after they have graduated from high school?"⁴ We asked analysts to complete the following tasks:

- *Task 1: Hypothesis generation.* Imagining they had access to any kind of data imaginable, analysts brainstormed at least three hypotheses related to the research question.
- *Task 2: Conceptual modeling.* Next, analysts saw a sample data schema and developed a conceptual model for one or more of their hypotheses. We used the term "conceptual model" instead of "causal model" to avoid (mis)leading analysts. We provided the following definition: "A conceptual model summarizes the process by which some outcome occurs. A conceptual model specifies the factors you think influence an outcome, what factors you think do not influence an outcome, and how those factors might interact to give rise to the outcome."
- *Task 3: Statistical model specification.* Finally, we presented analysts with a sample dataset and instructed them to specify but not implement a statistical model to test one or more of their hypotheses.

After the three tasks, we conducted a semi-structured interview with analysts about (i) their validity concerns⁵ and (ii) experiences. To help us contextualize our observations and assess the generalizability of our findings, we asked analysts to compare the study's structure and tasks to their day-to-day data analysis practices.

Part 2: Take-home analysis. After the first Zoom session, analysts implemented their analyses using the previously shown dataset, shared any analysis artifacts (e.g., scripts, output, visualizations, etc.), and completed a survey about their implementation experience. Prior to Part 3, the first author reviewed all submitted materials and developed participant-specific questions for the final interview.

Part 3: Final Interview. The first author asked analysts to give an overview of their analysis process and describe the hypotheses they tested, how their analysis impacted their conceptual model and understanding, why they made certain implementation choices, what challenges they faced (if any), and any additional concerns about validity.

Materials: The data schema and dataset used in the study came from a publicly available dataset from the Pew Research Center [79]. Each task was presented in a separate document. All study materials are included as supplementary material.

⁴We chose the open-ended research question about income after high school because we expected it to be widely approachable and require no domain expertise to understand.

⁵If analysts were unfamiliar with the term "validity," we rephrased the questions to be about "soundness" or "reliability."

Analysis: The first author reviewed the analysts’ artifacts multiple times to analyze their content and structure; thematically analyzed notes and transcripts from analysts’ Zoom sessions; and regularly discussed observations with the other authors throughout analysis.

4.2 Findings and Discussion

Eighteen of the 24 analysts we recruited completed all three parts of the study. The other six analysts completed only the first Zoom session. In our analysis, we incorporate data from all analysts for as far as they completed the study.

We found that analysts had four major steps (**RQ1 - Steps**) and considerations (**RQ2 - Process**): (i) identifying or creating proxies, (ii) fitting their present analysis to familiar approaches, (iii) using their tools to specify models (**RQ3 - Tools**), and (iv) minimizing bias by being data-based. Analysts also faced challenges acquiring and incorporating domain and statistical knowledge (**RQ2 - Process**).

4.2.1 Analysts consider proxies and data collection while articulating hypotheses. We encouraged analysts to not consider the feasibility of collecting data while brainstorming hypotheses. Yet, while brainstorming hypotheses, analysts expressed concern with how to measure constructs [A2, A5, A8, A12, A18, A22, A24] and how to obtain data [A2, A6, A8, A9, A11, A21, A24].

For instance, A18 grappled with the idea of ‘privilege’ and how to best quantify it:

“I’m trying to highlight the fact that those who will be privileged before graduation...that experience will enable them to make again more money after graduation. I won’t say ‘privilege’ because we need to quantify and qualify for that...it’s just an abstract term.”

Eventually, A18 wrote two separate hypotheses about ‘privilege,’ operationalizing it as parental income: (1) “People with higher incomes pre graduating, end up having higher differences between pre and post graduation incomes than those with lower incomes pre graduation.” and (2) “People with parents with lower incomes tend to have lower incomes pre graduation than those with parents with higher incomes.”

A18 continued to deliberate ‘privilege’ as measured by low and high income, saying, “...again you need to be careful with low and high because these are just abstract terms. We need to quantify that. What does it mean to be ‘low?’ What does it mean to be ‘high?’”. Finally, A18 decided to “maybe use the American standards for low income and high income.” Although an accepted “American standard” may not exist, A18 nevertheless believed that cultural context was necessary to specify because it could provide a normalizing scale to compare income during analysis, demonstrating how analysts plan ahead for statistical modeling while brainstorming and refining hypotheses.

Similarly, A2 was very specific about how to measure personality: “More extraverted individuals (extraversion measured using the corresponding social network graph) are likely to achieve higher yearly income later in life.”

In the presence of the data schema, more analysts were concerned with proxies [A2, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9, A16, A18, A21]. Some even adapted their working definitions to match the available data, similar to how researchers in the content analysis determined proxies based on data. For instance, A8, who hypothesized that “individuals interested in STEM fields tend to earn more post high school than individuals interested in other fields,” operationalized “interest” as “Major” — a variable included in the data schema — even though they had previously brainstormed using other proxies such as club attendance in high school.

These analysts’ closely related considerations of data and concept measurement demonstrate how conceptual hypotheses and data collection may inform each other, corroborating our findings from the content analysis.

Create new variables:

Adj_annual_income - take the midpoint of the ranges in the Annual Income column as a numeric value. (numeric)

State_avg_income - find the average income of individuals in each state from established benchmarks. (numeric)

Income_over_avg - take the difference between each individual's income with the average for their state.

Testing Major vs income: take all rows with a college degree (2 year associate and up) & major. Omit rows with no info on income.

For each major, calculate the average Adj_annual_income.

Also, calculate the average Adj_annual_income for all the college rows from above.

Create a set of histograms (one for each major) showing the spread of Adj_annual_income for the people in that group. The histograms should share the same x axis. The bins will be normalized to sum to 100% for each major group.



Arrange the data like so

Major	Avg Income (within major)	Avg income (sample population)
Bio	####	####
Stats	####	####
etc.	####	####

Chi-squared test.

H₀: for each major group, the average income is equal to the entire sample population's average income. That is, no single group has a significant difference in avg income from the sample population.

H_A: at least one of the major groups has an average income that's significantly different from the sample population.

Test for a p-value ≤ 0.05

One caveat of our selected test is even if we are able to reject H₀, we can't make conclusions about which major group is the one making the different. It's possible that just one group is; it's possible that every group is significantly different from the population writ large.

Fig. 3. Sample statistical specification (A8).

The lab study tasked analysts to specify their statistical models without considering implementation. Analyst A8 wrote a list (split across two pages) of detailed steps involved in creating new variables, cleaning and wrangling data, visualizing data, and testing their hypothesis. We expected analysts would articulate their statistical models mathematically. Instead, analysts specified their statistical models using todo lists and summaries of steps, which sometimes included mentions of software tools, showing that implementation was an important consideration and that tool familiarity may limit which statistical models analysts consider and implement.

4.2.2 Analysts consider implementation and tools when specifying statistical models. When we asked analysts to specify their models without considering implementation, we anticipated they would write mathematical models that they could then implement using their tools because (a) some researchers in the literature survey did so in their papers and (b) several analysts mentioned having years of analysis experience. However, despite the explicit instruction to disregard implementation, 16 analysts provided to-do lists or summaries of steps to perform a statistical analysis as their model specifications [A1, A2, A3, A5, A7, A8, A9, A11, A12, A14, A16, A18, A20, A21, A22, A24]. Only one analyst, A19 (6/10 analysis experience), attempted to specify their models mathematically but gave up because although they knew the general form of logistic regression, they did not know how to represent the specific variables in the model they wanted to perform.

For example, A8 (7/10 for analysis experience), specified a list of steps that included creating new variables that aggregated columns in the dataset, cleaning and wrangling the data, visualizing histograms, performing chi-squared test, and interpreting the statistical results. Notably, A8 also specified null and alternative hypotheses, which acted as an intermediate artifact during hypothesis formalization. Figure 3 shows A8's statistical specification.

Nine analysts went so far as to mention specific libraries, even functions, that they would use to program their analyses [A3, A9, A12, A13, A14, A16, A19, A21, A23]. In their reflective interviews, analysts also expressed that they often do not specify models outside of implementing them, which A19 succinctly described:

"I don't normally write this down because all of this is in a [software] library."

The implementation and software details analysts discussed and included in their specifications suggest that analysts skip over mathematical equations and jump to specification and implementation in their tools even though some papers included equations as an intermediate step in our content analysis. Additionally, analysts' statistical knowledge is situated

in the programs they write, and their knowledge of and familiarity with tools constrains the statistical methods they explore and consider. As such, tools may be a key point of intervention for guiding analysts toward statistical methods that may be unfamiliar but are best suited for their conceptual hypotheses.

4.2.3 Analysts try to fit analyses to previous projects and familiar approaches. Analysts spent significant thought and time categorizing their analyses as “prediction”, “classification” or “correlation” problems [A2, A3, A7, A10, A11, A18, A19, A21, A22]. To categorize, analysts relied on their previous projects. While reflecting on their typical analysis process, A21 said,

*“I usually tend to jump...to look at data and **match [the analysis problem] with similar patterns I have seen in the past and start implementing that or do some rough diagrams [for thinking about parameters, data type, and implementation] on paper...and start implementing it.”***

Analysts also looked at variable data types (i.e., categorical or continuous) to categorize. For example, A3 pivoted from thinking about **predicting** income to **classifying** income groups (emphasis added) based on data type information:

*“The income, the column, the target value here, is categorical. I think maybe it wouldn’t be a bad idea to see what **classification** tasks, what we could do. So instead of trying to **predict** because we’re not trying to **predict an exact number**, it seems...like more of a **classification** problem...”*

A provocative case of adhering to prior experiences was A6. Although several analysts were surprised and frustrated that income was ordinal in the dataset with categories such as “Under \$10K,” “\$10K to \$20K,” “\$20K to \$30K,” up to “\$150K+”, none went so far as A6 to synthetically generate normally distributed income data so that they could implement the linear regression models they had specified despite saying they knew that income was not normally distributed.

When asked further about the importance of normal data, A6, a research scientist, described how they plan analyses based on having normal data, strive to collect normally distributed, and rely on domain knowledge to transform the data to be normal when it may not be after collection:

“...I feel like having non normal data is something that’s like hard for us to deal with. Like it just kind of messes everything up like. And I know, I know it’s not always assumption of all the tasks, but just that we tend to try really hard to get our variables to be normally distributed. So, you know, we might like transform it or, you know, kind of clean it like clean outliers, maybe transform if needed...I mean, it makes sense because like a lot of measures we do use are like depressive symptoms or anxiety symptoms and kind of they’re naturally normally distributed...I can probably count on my hand the number of non parametric tests I’ve like included in manuscripts.”

A6’s description of their day-to-day analyses exemplifies the dual-search nature of hypothesis formalization: Analysts (i) jump from hypothesis refinement to model specification or implementation with specific proxies in mind and then (ii) collect and manipulate their data to fit their model choices.

We recognize that analysts may have taken shortcuts for the study they would not typically make in real life. Nevertheless, the constraints we imposed by using a real-world dataset are to be expected in real-world analyses. Therefore, our observations still suggest that rather than consider the nature and structure of their hypotheses and data to inform using new statistical approaches, which statistical pedagogy and theory may suggest, analysts may choose familiar statistical approaches and mold their new analyses after previous ones.

4.2.4 Analysts try to minimize their biases by focusing on data. Throughout the study, analysts expressed concern that they were biasing the analysis process. Analysts drew upon their personal experiences to develop hypotheses

[A5, A10, A13, A15, A16, A20, A21, A24] and conceptual models [A8, A12, A20, A24]. A12 described how their personal experiences may subconsciously bias their investigation by comparing a hypothetical physicist and social worker answering the same research question:

“Whereas a social worker by design...they’re meant to look at the humanity behind the numbers [unlike a physicist]. So like, they may actually end up with different results...actually sitting in front of this data, trying to model it.”

A few analysts even refused to specify conceptual models for fear of biasing the statistical analyses [A10, A11, A19]. On the surface, analysts resisted because they believed that some relationships, such as the effect of age on income, were too “obvious” and did not warrant documentation [A10, A11]. However, relationships between variables that were “obvious” to some analysts were not to others. For instance, A10 described how income would plateau with age, but other analysts, such as A18 while implementing their analyses, assumed income would monotonically increase with age.

When we probed further into why A10, A11, and A19 rejected a priori conceptual models, they echoed A10’s belief that conceptual models “put blinders on you.” Even the analysts who created conceptual models echoed similar concerns of wanting to “[l]et the model do the talking” in their implementations [A3, A15, A18, A19]. Instead of conceptual modeling, A10 chose to look at all n-ary relationships in the dataset to determine which variables to keep in a final statistical model, saying,

“It’s so easy to run individual tests...You can run hypothesis tests faster than you can actually think of what the hypothesis might be so there’s no need to really presuppose what relationships might exist [in a conceptual model].”

Of course, one could start from the same premise that statistical tests are so easy to execute and conclude that conceptual modeling is all the more important to prioritize analyses and prevent false discoveries.

Similarly, analysts were split on whether they focused their implementation exclusively on their hypotheses or examined other relationships in the dataset opportunistically. Nine analysts stuck strictly to testing their hypotheses [A1, A4, A5, A6, A7, A11, A13, A20, A24]. However, five analysts were more focused on exploring relationships in the dataset and pushed their hypotheses aside [A2, A3, A10, A16, A18], and an additional four analysts explored relationships among variables not previously specified in their hypotheses in addition to their hypotheses [A14, A15, A17, A21]. A18 justified their choice to ignore their hypotheses and focus on emergent relationships in the data by saying that they wanted to be “open minded based on the data...open to possibilities.”

Analysts’ concerns about bias and choice of which relationships to analyze (hypothesis only vs. opportunistic) highlight the tension between the two searches involved in hypothesis formalization: concept-first model implementations and implementation-first conceptual understanding. Conceptual models are intermediate artifacts that could reconcile the two search processes and challenge analysts’ ideas of what “data-driven” means. However, given some analysts’ resistance to prior conceptual modeling, workflows that help analysts conceptually model as a way to reflect on their model implementations and personal biases may be more promising than ones that require them before implementation.

4.2.5 Analysts face challenges obtaining and integrating conceptual and statistical information. Based on analysts’ information search behaviors and self-reports, we found that analysts faced challenges obtaining and integrating both domain and statistical knowledge.

Analysts consulted outside resources such as API documentation, Wikipedia, and the *Towards Data Science* blog throughout the study: one while brainstorming hypotheses [A13]; three while conceptual modeling [A12, A13, A22]; six

while specifying statistical models [A3, A6, A12, A13]. Six analysts also mentioned consulting outside resources while implementing their analyses [A1, A3, A11, A14, A15, A21]. By far, statistical help was the most common.

Furthermore, when analysts reflected on their prior data analysis experiences, they detailed how collaborators provided domain and statistical expertise that are instrumental in formalizing hypotheses. Collaborators share data that help domain experts generate hypotheses [A9], critique and revise conceptual models and proxies [A4, A8], answer critical data quality questions [A10], and ensure statistical methods are appropriate [A5, A6, A22].

In the survey participants completed after implementing their analyses, the three most commonly reported challenges were (i) **formatting** the data [A1, A4, A5, A6, A13, A16, A18, A20, A21, A24], (ii) **identifying** which statistical analyses to perform with the data to test their hypotheses [A1, A11, A14, A18, A20, A21], and (iii) **implementing and executing** analyses using their tools [A1, A6, A7, A13, A20, A21]. Although we expected analysts would have difficulty wrangling their data based on prior work [45], we were surprised that identifying and executing statistical tests were also prevalent problems given that (a) analysts were relatively experienced and (b) could choose their tools. These results, together with our observations that analysts rely on their prior experiences and tools, suggest that analysts have difficulty adapting to new scenarios where new tools and statistical approaches may be necessary.

4.3 Takeaways from the Lab Study

After the first session, 13 out of the 24 analysts described all the tasks as familiar, and 10 described most of the tasks and process as familiar. Analysts commonly remarked that although the process was familiar, the order of the tasks was “opposite” of their usual workflows. In practice, analysts may start with model implementation before articulating conceptual hypotheses, which opposes the direction of data analysis that the ASA recommends [17]. Nevertheless, our observations reinforce the dual-search, non-linear nature of hypothesis formalization.

Moreover, one analyst, A24, a physics researcher who primarily conducted simulation-based studies expressed that the study and its structure felt foreign, especially because they had no control over data collection. Other analysts in the study also described the importance of designing and conducting data collection as part of their hypothesis formalization process [A4, A6, A9]. Designing data collection methods informs the statistical models analysts plan to use and helps to refine their conceptual hypotheses by requiring analysts to identify proxies and the feasibility of collecting the proxy measures, reinforcing what we saw in the content analysis. The remarks also suggest that disciplines practice variations of the hypothesis formalization process we identify based on discipline-specific data collection norms and constraints. For example, simulating data may sometimes take less time than collecting human subjects data, so analysts working with simulations may dive into modeling and data whereas others may need to plan experiments for a longer period of time.

Finally, we found that analysts relied on prior experiences and tools to specify and formalize their hypotheses. Tools that scaffold the hypothesis formalization process by suggesting statistical models that operationalize the conceptual hypotheses, conceptual models, or partial specifications analysts create along the way may (i) nudge analysts towards more robust analyses that test their hypotheses, (ii) overcome limitations of analysts’ prior experiences, and (iii) even expand analysts’ statistical knowledge. Thus, we investigated how current tool designs serve (or under-serve) hypothesis formalization.

5 ANALYSIS OF SOFTWARE TOOLS

To understand how the design of statistical computing tools may support or hinder hypothesis formalization (**RQ3 - Tools**), we analyzed widely used software packages and suites. Our observations in the lab study motivated and focused our analysis. Throughout, we use the term “package” to refer to a set of programs that must be invoked through code,

such as `lme4`, `scipy`, and `statsmodels`. We use the term “suite” to refer to a collection of packages that end-users can access either through code or graphical user interfaces (GUIs), such as SPSS, SAS, and JMP. We use the term “tool” to refer to both.

5.1 Method

Sample: We consulted online data analysis fora [8, 9, 30, 69] to identify and include widely used tools. We also included tools that appeared more than once across the content analysis and lab study. The final sample included 20 statistical tools: 14 packages (R: 10, Python: 4); three suites that support in-tool programming; and three suites that do not support programming. Table 1 contains an overview of our sample and results.

Analysis: Four specific questions guided our analysis:

- **Specialization:** Analysts in the lab study eagerly named specific statistical tools they would use and looked up tool documentation during the tasks. This prompted us to ask *How specialized are the tools, and how might specialization (or lack thereof) affect how analysts discover and use them to formalize hypotheses?*
- **Statistical Taxonomies:** Analysts in the lab study tried to mold their analysis to prior experiences and their taxonomies of statistical methods. We wondered what role tools play in this: *How do tools organize and group statistical models? How might tool organization and analysts’ taxonomies interplay during hypothesis formalization?*
- **Model Expression:** Analysts in the lab study did not specify their statistical models mathematically. Instead, they jumped to model implementation. We wondered if this was due to how tools enable analysts to express their models: *What notation must analysts use to express models in the tools?*
- **Computational Issues:** It was uncommon for researchers in the content analysis to specify the software tools they used. However, when researchers did mention software, they also specified the functions, parameters, and settings used, prompting us to wonder about the importance of computational settings: *What specific kinds of computational control do tools provide end-users and how might that impact hypothesis formalization?*

To answer the four questions for each statistical tool, the first author read and took notes on published articles about tools’ designs and implementations, API documentation and reference manuals, and available source code; followed online tutorials; consulted question-and-answer sites (e.g., StackExchange) when necessary; and analyzed sample data with the tools. The first author paid particular attention to tool organization, programming idioms, functions and their parameters, and tool failure cases. Table 1 contains citations for resources consulted in the analysis.

The analysis process was iterative and involved discussions among the co-authors about how to evaluate the properties of tools from our perspectives as both tool designers/maintainers and end-users. Here, we focus on end-user (hereafter referred to as analyst) perspectives informed by our lab study and make callouts to details relevant for tool designers.

5.2 Findings and Discussion

We discuss our findings in light of our characterization of hypothesis formalization in Figure 1. We refer to specific steps and transitions in Figure 1 in **boldface**.

5.2.1 Tool specialization pushes computational concerns higher up the hypothesis formalization process. Half the tools [T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T11, T12] in our sample are specialized in the scope of statistical analysis methods they support (e.g., `brms` supports Bayesian generalized linear multilevel modeling). `edgeR` [T3] provides multiple modeling methods but is specialized to the context of biological count data. Such specialized tools are vital to creating a widely adopted statistical computing ecosystem, such as R. However, highly specialized packages also come at a cost.

Table 1. Overview of the software tools included in our analysis.

Half of the tools are specialized for specific modeling use cases. Most tools use mathematical notation (T18–T20 (✓*)) even use mathematical notation in their GUIs). Most tools also provide a wide range of computational control although sometimes they require additional packages [T5, T13]. Tool specialization, organization, notation, and computational control focus analysts on model implementation details, sometimes at the expense of focusing on their conceptual hypotheses.

ID	Tool name	Specialized Scope	Mathematical Notation	Computational Control	References
R Packages					
T1	MASS	—	✓	✓	[70]
T2	brms	✓	✓	✓	[13, 14]
T3	edgeR	✓	✓	✓	[18, 19]
T4	glmmTMB	✓	✓	✓	[11, 57]
T5	glmnet	✓	—	✓(additional)	[25, 34]
T6	lme4	✓	✓	✓	[3, 4]
T7	MCMCglmm	✓	✓	✓	[32, 33]
T8	nlme	✓	✓	✓	[67]
T9	RandomForest	✓	✓	✓(minimal)	[10]
T10	stats (core library)	—	✓	✓	[80]
Python Packages					
T11	Keras	✓	—	✓(minimal)	[21]
T12	Scikit-learn	✓	—	✓	[12, 62, 75]
T13	Scipy (scipy.stats)	—	—	✓(additional)	[40–42]
T14	Statsmodels	—	✓	—	[63, 76]
Suites, with DSLs for programming					
T15	Matlab (Statistics and ML Toolbox)	—	—	✓	[81, 82]
T16	SPSS	—	✓	✓	[77]
T17	Stata	—	✓	—	[55, 56, 78]
Suites, without programming					
T18	GraphPrism	—	✓*	✓	[28]
T19	JASP	—	✓*	—	[61]
T20	JMP	—	✓*	—	[39, 72]

Specialized tools require analysts to consider computational settings while picking a statistical tool and, possibly, even while mathematically relating their variables. Thus, specialized tools fuse the last two steps of hypothesis formalization (**Statistical Specification** and **Model Implementation**). Ultimately, specialization requires analysts to have more (i) computational knowledge and (ii) foresight about their model implementations at the cost of focusing on conceptual or data-related concerns early in hypothesis formalization.

One way tool designers minimize the requisite computational knowledge and foresight while providing the benefits of specialized packages — which may be optimal for specific statistical models or data analysis tasks — is to provide micro-ecosystems of packages. For example, R’s `tidymodels` [52] and `tidyverse` [86] create micro-ecosystems that use consistent API syntax and semantics across interoperable packages. They also push analysts towards what the tool designers believe to be best practices, such as the use of the tidy data format. Tools that aim to support hypothesis formalization may consider fitting into or creating micro-ecosystems that provide tool support all along the process, focusing analysts on concepts, data, or model implementation at various points.

5.2.2 Tool taxonomies introduce challenges that detract from hypothesis formalization. A consequence of tool specialization is the fragmented view of statistical approaches. For example, we observed analysts in the lab study who

viewed the analysis as a classification task gravitate towards machine learning-focused libraries, such as `RandomForest` [T9], `Keras` [T11], and `scikit-learn` [T12]. Because classification can be implemented as logistic regression, any tool that supports logistic regression, such as the core `stats` library in R [T10], provides equally valid, alternative perspectives on the same analysis and hypothesis. However, tools obfuscate these connections and do not aid analysts in considering reasonable statistical models that may be unfamiliar or outside their personal taxonomy. This may explain why analysts adhered to their personal taxonomies during the lab study.

This problem carries over to tools that support numerous statistical methods. Ten tools in our sample intend to provide more comprehensive statistical support [T1, T10, T13, T14, T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20]. These tools group statistical approaches using brittle and inconsistent taxonomies based on data types [T17]; tool-defined analysis classes that are both highly specific (e.g., “Item Response Theory”) and vague (e.g., “Multivariate analyses”) [T15, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20]; and disciplines or applications (e.g., “Epidemiology and related,” “Direct Marketing”) [T16, T17, T20]. Although well-intended to simplify statistical method selection, tools’ taxonomies are at times misleading. For instance, JMP combines various linear models into a “Fit Model” option that is separate from “Predictive Modeling” and “Specialized Modeling,” which are also distinct from the more general “Multivariate Methods.” Once analysts select the “Fit Model” option, they can specify the “Personality” of their model as “Generalized Regression,” “Generalized Linear Model,” or “Partial Least Squares,” among many others. This JMP menu structure may lead an analyst to conclude that (i) a Partial Least Squares model is distinct from a regression model when it is in fact a type of regression model and (ii) regression is not useful for prediction.

In these ways, tools add a “Navigate taxonomies” step before the **Statistical Specification** step, requiring analysts to match their conceptual hypotheses with the tools’ taxonomies, which may misalign with their personal taxonomies. One reason for this issue may be that tools do not leverage analysts’ intermediate artifacts or understanding during hypothesis formalization. By the time analysts transition to **Statistical Specification**, they have refined their conceptual hypotheses, developed causal models, and made observations about data. However, tools’ taxonomies require analysts to set these aside and consider another set of decisions imposed by tool-specific groupings of statistical methods.

5.2.3 Syntactic and semantic mismatches create a rift between model implementations and conceptual hypotheses.

Fifteen tools in our sample provide analysts with interfaces that use mathematical notation to express statistical models [T1, T2, T3, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T14, T16, T17, T18, T19, T20]. R and Python packages use symbolic mathematical syntax, and SPSS and Stata use natural language-like syntax. Expressing a linear model with Sex, Race, and their interaction as predictors of Annual Income involves the formula $\text{AnnualIncome} \sim \text{Sex} + \text{Race} + \text{Sex}*\text{Race}$ in `lme4` and `AnnualIncome BY Sex Race Sex*Race` in SPSS. In a linear execution of steps involved in hypothesis formalization where analysts relate variables mathematically (**Mathematical Equation**) before specifying and implementing models using tools (**Statistical Specification, Model Implementation**), the mathematical interfaces match analysts’ progression. However, in the lab study analysts did not specify their models mathematically even when given the opportunity, suggesting that mathematical syntax may not adequately capture analysts’ conceptual or statistical considerations.

Syntactic similarity between packages may lower the barrier to trying and adopting new statistical approaches but may introduce unmet expectations of semantic similarity. For example, `brms` [T2] uses the same formula syntax as `lme4` [T6], smoothing the transition between linear modeling and Bayesian linear modeling for analysts. However, based on syntactic similarity, analysts may incorrectly assume statistical equivalence in computed model values. For example, in `brms`, the model intercept is the mean of the posterior when all the independent variables are at *their means*, but in `lme4`, the intercept is the mean of the model when all the independent variables are *at zero*.

Furthermore, tools introduce syntactic differences between statistical approaches that are for the most part semantically equivalent. For instance, an ANOVA with repeated measures and a linear mixed effects model are similar in intent but require two different function calls, one without a formula (e.g., `AnovaRM` in `statsmodels` [T14]) and another with (e.g., `mixedlm` in `statsmodels` [T14]). Even when considering only ANOVA, tools may provide similar syntax but implement different sums of squares procedures for partitioning variance (i.e., Type I, Type II, or Type III).⁶ By default, R’s `stats` [T10] core package [T10] uses Type I, `statsmodels` [T14] uses Type II, and SPSS [T16] uses Type III. The three different sum of squares procedures lead to different F-statistics and p-values, which may lead analysts to different conclusions. More importantly, the procedures encode different conceptual hypotheses. If analysts have theoretical knowledge or conceptual hypotheses about the order of independent variables, tools defaulting to Type I (e.g., R’s `stats` core library) align the model implementation with the conceptual hypotheses. However, if analysts do not have such conceptual hypotheses, tools’ default behavior would execute (without error) and silently respond to a conceptual hypothesis different from the one the analyst seeks to test.

The impact of tools’ “invisible” model implementation choices reinforces the interplay between conceptual and model implementation concerns during hypothesis formalization. Tools should highlight the conceptual assumptions and consequences of modeling choices beyond listing ways to change defaults in their documentation manuals or Q&A sites. Doing this would give analysts more control over and insight into their analysis. Analysts could revise and refine their hypotheses in response to statistical modeling constraints or change the statistical models and tools they use to address their hypotheses.

5.2.4 Fine-grained computational control may require conceptual hypothesis revisions. Tools provide end-users with options for optimizers and solvers used to fit statistical models [T1, T2, T4, T6, T7, T8, T10, T11, T13, T16, T18], convergence criteria used for fitting models [T3, T6, T16, T18], and memory and CPU allocation [T2, T5, T12, T15], among more specific customizations. For instance, `lme4` [T6] allows analysts to specify the nonlinear optimizer and its settings (e.g., the number of iterations, convergence criteria, etc.) used to fit models. In `brms` [T2], analysts can also specify the number of CPUs to dedicate to fitting their models. Some computational settings are akin to performance optimizations, affecting computer utilization but not the results. However, not all computational changes are so well-isolated.

For example, the lack of model convergence (in **Model Implementation**) may prompt mathematical re-formulation (**Mathematical Equation**), which may cast **Observations about Data** in a new light, prompting **Causal Model** and **Conceptual Hypothesis** revision. In other words, computational failures and decisions may bubble up to conceptual hypothesis revision and refinement, which may then trickle back down to model implementation iteration, and so on. In this way, computational control can be another entry into the dual-search process of hypothesis formalization.

Although in theory this low-level control could help analysts formalize nuanced conceptual hypotheses in diverse computational environments, we found that tools do not currently provide feedback on the ramifications of these computational changes, introducing a gulf of evaluation [60]. Analysts can easily change parameters to fine-tune their computational settings, but how they should interpret their model implementations and revisions conceptually is unaddressed, suggesting opportunities for future tools to bridge the conceptual and model implementation gap.

⁶Type I is (a) sensitive to the order in which independent variables are specified because it assigns variance sequentially and (b) allows interaction terms. Type II (a) does not assign variance sequentially and (b) does not allow interaction terms. Type III (a) does not assign variance sequentially and (b) allows interaction terms. For an easy-to-understand blog post, see [50].

5.3 Takeaways from the Analysis of Tools

Taken together, our analysis shows that tools can support a wide range of statistical models but expect analysts to have more statistical expertise than may be realistic. They provide limited guidance for analysts to identify reasonable models and little-to-no feedback on the conceptual ramifications of model implementation iterations. This reveals a misalignment between analysts’ hypothesis formalization processes and tools’ expectations and design. Possible reasons for this mismatch may be that tools do not scaffold or embody the dual-search nature of hypothesis formalization or leverage all the intermediate artifacts analysts may create (e.g., refined conceptual hypotheses, causal models, data observations, partial specifications, etc.) throughout the process.

6 IMPLICATIONS

Our findings and characterization of hypothesis formalization suggest three opportunities for tools to facilitate the dual-search process and align conceptual hypotheses with statistical model implementations at various stages of hypothesis formalization.

6.1 Meta-libraries: Connecting Model Implementations with Mathematical Equations

Specialized tools, although necessary for statistical computation, require a steep learning curve. Additionally, how tool interfaces, model implementation, and computed outputs are connected is ambiguous, even if analysts use symbolic formulae. *Meta-libraries* could allow analysts to specify their models in high-level code; find the appropriate library or libraries to execute such a model in its knowledge base; execute the model using the appropriate libraries; and then output library information, functions invoked, any computational settings used, the mathematical model that is approximated, and the model results. For example, libraries such as Parsnip [51] have begun to provide a unified higher-level interface that allows analysts to specify a statistical model using more “generically” named functions, parameter names, and symbolic formulae (when necessary). Parsnip then compiles and invokes various library-specific functions for the same statistical model.

Meta-libraries designed as such could bring three benefits. First, they would provide simpler, less fragmented interfaces to analysts while continuing to take advantage of tool specialization. Second, meta-libraries that output complete mathematical representations would more tightly couple mathematical representations with implementations, providing an on-ramp for analysts to expand their statistical knowledge. Third, meta-libraries that showed the mathematical representations alongside underlying libraries’ function calls could show syntactical variation in underlying libraries, indirectly teaching analysts how they might express their statistical models in other tools and familiarizing analysts with new tools and models.

Future meta-libraries could consider providing a higher-level, declarative interface that does not require analysts to write symbolic formulae. Designing such declarative meta-libraries would require formative elicitation studies (similar to natural programming studies such as [84]) on declarative primitives that are memorable, distinguishable, and reliably understood. An additional challenge would lie in maintaining support for various libraries executed under the hood, especially as libraries change their APIs, which would strengthen the case for meta-libraries. Although meta-libraries would not solve the problems involved in understanding how computational settings affect model execution or conceptual hypotheses, they could nevertheless provide scaffolding for analysts to more closely examine specific libraries, especially if multiple libraries execute the same model but do not all encounter the same computational bottlenecks.

6.2 High-level Libraries: Expressing Conceptual Hypotheses to Bootstrap Model Implementations

A possible explanation for why analysts in the lab study started with model implementation is the absence of tools for directly expressing conceptual hypotheses. High-level libraries could allow analysts to specify data collection design (e.g., independent variables, dependent variables, controlled effects, possible random effects); variable data types; expected or known covariance relationships based on domain expertise; and hypothesized findings in a library-specific grammar. High-level libraries could compile these conceptual and data declarations into weighted constraints that represent the applicability of various statistical approaches, in a fashion similar to Tea [43], a domain-specific language for automatically selecting appropriate statistical analyses for common hypothesis tests. Libraries could then execute the appropriate statistical approaches, possibly by using a meta-library as described above.

In addition to questions of how to represent a robust taxonomy of statistical approaches computationally, another key challenge for developing high-level libraries is identifying a set of minimal yet complete primitives that are useful and usable for analysts to express information that is usually expressed at different levels of abstraction: conceptual hypotheses, study designs, and possibly even partial statistical model specifications. For instance, even if a conceptual hypothesis is expressible in a library, it may be impossible to answer with a study design or partial statistical model that is expressed in the same program. An approach may be to draw upon and integrate aspects from existing high-level libraries and systems that aim to address separate steps of the hypothesis formalization process, such as Touchstone2 [23] for study design and Tea and Statsplorer [85] for statistical analysis.

6.3 Bidirectional Conceptual Modeling: Co-authoring Conceptual Models and Model Implementations

Conceptual, or causal, modeling was difficult for the analysts in the lab study. Some even resisted conceptual modeling for fear of biasing their analyses. Yet, implicit conceptual models were evident in the hypotheses analysts chose to implement and the sub-hypotheses researchers articulated in the content analysis.

Mixed-initiative systems that make explicit the connection between conceptual models and statistical model implementations could facilitate hypothesis formalization from either search process and allow analysts to reflect on their analyses without fear of bias. For example, a mixed-initiative programming environment could allow analysts to write an analysis script, detect data variables in the analysis scripts, identify how groups of variables co-occur in statistical models, and then visualize conceptual models as graphs where the nodes represent variables and the edges represent relationships. The automatically generated conceptual models would serve as templates that analysts could then manipulate and update to better reflect their internal conceptual models by specifying the kind of relationship between variables (e.g., correlation, linear model, etc.) and assigning any statistical model roles (e.g., independent variable, dependent variable). As analysts update the visual conceptual models, they could evaluate script changes the system proposes. In this way, analysts could externally represent their causal models while authoring analysis scripts and vice versa.

Although bidirectional programming environments already exist for vector graphics creation [35], they have yet to be realized in mainstream data analysis tools. To realize bidirectional, automatic conceptual modeling, researchers would need to address important questions about (i) the visual grammar, which would likely borrow heavily from the causal modeling literature; (ii) program analysis techniques for identifying variables and defining co-occurrences (e.g., line-based vs. function-based) in a way that generalizes to multiple statistical libraries; and (iii) adoption, as analysts who may benefit most from such tools (likely domain non-experts) may be the most resistant to tools that limit the number of “insights” they take away from an analysis.

7 DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

Hypothesis formalization is a dual-search process of translating conceptual hypotheses into statistical model implementations. Due to constraints imposed by domain expertise, data, and tool familiarity, the same conceptual hypothesis may be formalized into different model implementations. The same model implementation may also formalize two possibly opposing hypotheses. To navigate these constraints, analysts use problem-solving strategies characteristic of the larger scientific discovery process [47, 73].

At a conceptual level, hypothesis formalization involves *hypothesis refinement*, which, to use Schunn and Klahr’s language [73], is a *scoping* process. In the content analysis, we found that researchers *decomposed* their research goals and conceptual hypotheses into specific, testable sub-hypotheses and *concretized* constructs using proxies, born of theory or available data. Corroborating these findings, we found that analysts in the lab study also quickly converged on the need to specify established proxies or develop them based on the data schema presented. In hypothesis formalization, scoping incorporates domain- and data-specific observations to qualify the conceptual scope of researchers’ hypotheses. In other words, hypothesis refinement is an instance of *means-end analysis* [59], a problem-solving strategy that aims to recursively change the current state of a problem into sub-goals (i.e., increasingly specific objectives) in order to apply a technique (i.e., a particular statistical model) to solve the problem (i.e., test a hypothesis).

At the other computational endpoint of hypothesis formalization, *model implementation* also involves iteration. Through our analysis of software tools, we found that analysts must not only select tools among an array of specialized and general choices but also navigate tool-specific taxonomies of statistical approaches. These tool taxonomies may both differ from and inform analysts’ personal categorizations, potentially explaining why analysts in our lab study relied on their personal taxonomies and tools. Based on their prior experience, analysts engage in *analogical* reasoning [37], finding parallels between the present analysis problem’s structure and previously encountered ones or ones that fit a tool’s design easily.

Upon selecting a statistical function, analysts may tune computational settings, choose different statistical functions or approaches, which they may tune, and so on. In this way, the model implementation loop in hypothesis formalization captures the “debugging cycles” analysts encounter, such as the census researcher in the introduction. The tool ecosystem as a whole supports diverse model implementations, even for the same mathematical equation. However, the tool interfaces provide low-level abstractions, such as interfaces using mathematical formulae that, based on our observations in the lab study, do not support the kind of higher-level conceptual reasoning required of hypothesis formalization.

The steps, considerations, and strategies we have identified are domain-general. Domain-specific expertise likely influences how quickly analysts switch between steps and strategies during the dual-search process. Domain experts, including researchers in our content analysis, may know which statistical model implementations and computational settings to use a priori and design their studies or specify their conceptual hypotheses in light of these expectations — incorporating means-end analysis and analogical reasoning strategies — more quickly. It may be these insights that analysts in our lab study sought when they looked online for conceptual and statistical help. Future work could observe how domain experts perform hypothesis formalization and characterize when and how analysts draw upon their own or collaborators’ expertise to circumvent iterations or justify early scoping decisions. These insights may also shed light on how pre-registration expectations and practices could be made more effective. Given the level of detail required of some pre-registration policies, researchers likely engage in a version of the hypothesis formalization process we have identified prior to registering their studies. Knowing how pre-registration fits into the hypothesis formalization process could improve the design and adoption of pre-registration practices.

Finally, our findings suggest opportunities for future tools to bridge steps involved in hypothesis formalization and guide analysts towards reasonable model implementations. Possibilities include connecting model implementations to their mathematical representations through meta-libraries, providing higher-level abstractions for more directly expressing conceptual hypotheses, and supporting automated conceptual modeling. Follow-up user studies in the lab and observational settings as well as system development and deployment are necessary to test these ideas, draw stronger conclusions about how tool design affects hypothesis formalization, and more readily support analysts translate their conceptual hypotheses into statistical model implementations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sara Alspaugh, Nava Zokaei, Andrea Liu, Cindy Jin, and Marti A Hearst. 2018. Futzing and moseying: Interviews with professional data analysts on exploration practices. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 25, 1 (2018), 22–31.
- [2] Timothy Ballard, David K. Sewell, Daniel Cosgrove, and Andrew Neal. 2019. Information Processing Under Reward Versus Under Punishment. *Psychological Science* 30, 5 (2019), 757–764.
- [3] Douglas Bates, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker, and Steve Walker. 2014. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823* (2014).
- [4] Douglas Bates, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker, Steve Walker, Rune H.B. Christensen, Henrik Singmann, Bin Dai, Fabian Scheipl, Gabor Grothendieck, Peter Green, and John Fox. 2019. Package ‘lme4’. *CRAN* (2019). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/lme4/lme4.pdf>"
- [5] Leilani Battle and Jeffrey Heer. 2019. Characterizing Exploratory Visual Analysis: A Literature Review and Evaluation of Analytic Provenance in Tableau. *Computer Graphics Forum (Proc. EuroVis)* (2019). "<http://idl.cs.washington.edu/papers/exploratory-visual-analysis>"
- [6] Jacques Bertin. 2011. *Graphics and graphic information processing*. Walter de Gruyter.
- [7] Natalie Biderman, Roy Luria, Andrei R. Teodorescu, Ron Hajaj, and Yonatan Goshen-Gottstein. 2019. Working Memory Has Better Fidelity Than Long-Term Memory: The Fidelity Constraint Is Not a General Property of Memory After All. *Psychological Science* 30, 2 (2019), 223–237.
- [8] Igor Bobriakov. 2017. Top 15 Python Libraries for Data Science in 2017. *ActiveWizards in Medium* (2017). "<https://medium.com/activewizards-machine-learning-company/top-15-python-libraries-for-data-science-in-in-2017-ab61b4f9b4a7>"
- [9] Igor Bobriakov. 2018. Top 20 Python libraries for data science in 2018. *ActiveWizards in Medium* (2018). "<https://medium.com/activewizards-machine-learning-company/top-20-python-libraries-for-data-science-in-2018-2ae7d1db8049>"
- [10] Leo Breiman, Adele Cutler, Andy Liaw, and Matthew Wiener. 2018. Package ‘randomForest’. (2018). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/randomForest/randomForest.pdf>"
- [11] Mollie E Brooks, Kasper Kristensen, Koen J van Benthem, Arni Magnusson, Casper W Berg, Anders Nielsen, Hans J Skaug, Martin Machler, and Benjamin M Bolker. 2017. glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized linear mixed modeling. *The R journal* 9, 2 (2017), 378–400.
- [12] Lars Buitinck, Gilles Louppe, Mathieu Blondel, Fabian Pedregosa, Andreas Mueller, Olivier Grisel, Vlad Niculae, Peter Prettenhofer, Alexandre Gramfort, Jaques Grobler, and others. 2013. API design for machine learning software: experiences from the scikit-learn project. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.0238* (2013).
- [13] Paul-Christian Bürkner and others. 2017. brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of statistical software* 80, 1 (2017), 1–28.
- [14] Paul-Christian Bürkner and Maintainer Paul-Christian Buerkner. 2016. Package ‘brms’. (2016).
- [15] Andrea Caggese, Vicente Cuñat, and Daniel Metzger. 2019a. Firing the wrong workers: Financing constraints and labor misallocation. *Journal of Financial Economics* 133, 3 (2019), 589–607.
- [16] Andrea Caggese, Vicente Cuñat, and Daniel Metzger. 2019b. Firing the wrong workers: Financing constraints and labor misallocation. *Journal of Financial Economics* 133, 3 (2019), 589–607.
- [17] Robert Carver, Michelle Everson, John Gabrosek, Nicholas Horton, Robin Lock, Megan Mocko, Allan Rossman, Ginger Holmes Roswell, Paul Velleman, Jeffrey Witmer, and others. 2016. Guidelines for assessment and instruction in statistics education (GAISE) college report 2016. (2016).
- [18] Yunshun Chen, Aaron TL Lun, Davis J McCarthy, Matthew E Ritchie, Belinda Phipson, Yifang Hu, Xiaobei Zhou, Mark D Robinson, and Gordon K Smyth. 2020a. Empirical Analysis of Digital Gene Expression Data in R (v3.30.3). (2020). "<https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/html/edgeR.html>"
- [19] Yunshun Chen, David McCarthy, Matthew Ritchie, Mark Robinson, and Gordon Smyth. 2020b. edgeR: differential analysis of sequence read count data. (2020). "<https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/vignettes/edgeR/inst/doc/edgeRUsersGuide.pdf>"
- [20] Nadia Chernyak, Kristin L. Leimgruber, Yarrow C. Dunham, Jingshi Hu, and Peter R. Blake. 2019. Paying Back People Who Harmed Us but Not People Who Helped Us: Direct Negative Reciprocity Precedes Direct Positive Reciprocity in Early Development. *Psychological Science* 30, 9 (2019),

- 1273–1286.
- [21] François Chollet and others. 2015. Keras. <https://keras.io>. (2015).
- [22] Samuel H Church, Seth Donoughe, Bruno AS de Medeiros, and Cassandra G Extavour. 2019. Insect egg size and shape evolve with ecology but not developmental rate. *Nature* 571, 7763 (2019), 58–62.
- [23] Alexander Eismayer, Chatchavan Wacharamanotham, Michel Beaudouin-Lafon, and Wendy Mackay. 2019. Touchstone2: An Interactive Environment for Exploring Trade-offs in HCI Experiment Design. (2019).
- [24] Janet Feigenspan, Christian Kästner, Jörg Liebig, Sven Apel, and Stefan Hanenberg. 2012. Measuring programming experience. In *2012 20th IEEE International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. IEEE, 73–82.
- [25] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, Rob Tibshirani, Balasubramanian Narasimhan, Kenneth Tay, Noah Simon, and Junyang Qian. 2020. Package ‘glmnet’. (2020). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/glmnet/index.html>"
- [26] Lukas Gehrke, Sezen Akman, Pedro Lopes, Albert Chen, Avinash Kumar Singh, Hsiang-Ting Chen, Chin-Teng Lin, and Klaus Gramann. 2019. Detecting visuo-haptic mismatches in virtual reality using the prediction error negativity of event-related brain potentials. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–11.
- [27] Andrew Gelman and Eric Loken. 2013. The garden of forking paths: Why multiple comparisons can be a problem, even when there is no “fishing expedition” or “p-hacking” and the research hypothesis was posited ahead of time. *Department of Statistics, Columbia University* (2013).
- [28] LLC. GraphPad Software. 2020. GraphPad Prism 8 User Guide. (2020). "<https://www.graphpad.com/guides/prism/8/user-guide/index.htm>"
- [29] John M Griffin, Samuel Kruger, and Gonzalo Maturana. 2019. Do labor markets discipline? Evidence from RMBS bankers. *Journal of Financial Economics* 133, 3 (2019), 726–750.
- [30] Garrett Grolemond. 2019. Quick list of useful R packages. *R Studio Support* (2019). "<https://support.rstudio.com/hc/en-us/articles/201057987-Quick-list-of-useful-R-packages>"
- [31] Garrett Grolemond and Hadley Wickham. 2014. A cognitive interpretation of data analysis. *International Statistical Review* 82, 2 (2014), 184–204.
- [32] Jarrod Hadfield. 2020. Package ‘MCMCglmm’. (2020). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MCMCglmm/MCMCglmm.pdf>"
- [33] Jarrod D Hadfield and others. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 33, 2 (2010), 1–22.
- [34] Trevor Hastie and Junyang Qian. 2014. Glmnet vignette. (2014). https://web.stanford.edu/~hastie/glmnet/glmnet_alpha.html
- [35] Brian Hempel, Justin Lubin, and Ravi Chugh. 2019. Sketch-n-Sketch: Output-Directed Programming for SVG. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 281–292.
- [36] Mireia Hernández, María Ángeles Palomar-García, Benito Nohales-Nieto, Gustau Olcina-Sempere, Esteban Villar-Rodríguez, Raúl Pastor, César Ávila, and Maria-Antònia Parcet. 2019. Separate Contribution of Striatum Volume and Pitch Discrimination to Individual Differences in Music Reward. *Psychological Science* 30, 9 (2019), 1352–1361.
- [37] John H Holland, Keith J Holyoak, Richard E Nisbett, and Paul R Thagard. 1989. *Induction: Processes of inference, learning, and discovery*. MIT press.
- [38] Pinghsun Huang, Hsin-Yi Huang, and Yan Zhang. 2019. Do firms hedge with foreign currency derivatives for employees? *Journal of Financial Economics* 133, 2 (2019), 418–440.
- [39] Bradley Jones and John Sall. 2011. JMP statistical discovery software. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* 3, 3 (2011), 188–194.
- [40] Eric Jones, Travis Oliphant, Pearu Peterson, and others. 2001–2020a. SciPy: Open source scientific tools for Python. (2001–2020). <http://www.scipy.org/>
- [41] Eric Jones, Travis Oliphant, Pearu Peterson, and others. 2001–2020b. SciPy: Open source scientific tools for Python. (2001–2020). <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/stats.html>
- [42] Eric Jones, Travis Oliphant, Pearu Peterson, and others. 2001–2020c. SciPy: Open source scientific tools for Python. (2001–2020). <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/optimize.html>
- [43] Eunice Jun, Maureen Daum, Jared Roesch, Sarah E Chasins, Emery D Berger, Rene Just, and Katharina Reinecke. 2019. Tea: A High-level Language and Runtime System for Automating Statistical Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM.
- [44] Alex Kale, Matthew Kay, and Jessica Hullman. 2019. Decision-making under uncertainty in research synthesis: Designing for the garden of forking paths. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–14.
- [45] Sean Kandel, Andreas Paepcke, Joseph M Hellerstein, and Jeffrey Heer. 2012. Enterprise data analysis and visualization: An interview study. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 18, 12 (2012), 2917–2926.
- [46] Norbert L Kerr. 1998. HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and social psychology review* 2, 3 (1998), 196–217.
- [47] David Klahr and Kevin Dunbar. 1988. Dual space search during scientific reasoning. *Cognitive science* 12, 1 (1988), 1–48.
- [48] David Klahr and Herbert A Simon. 1999. Studies of scientific discovery: Complementary approaches and convergent findings. *Psychological Bulletin* 125, 5 (1999), 524.
- [49] Gary Klein, Jennifer K Phillips, Erica L Rall, and Deborah A Peluso. 2007. A data–frame theory of sensemaking. In *Expertise out of context*.
Manuscript submitted to ACM

- Psychology Press, 118–160.
- [50] Joos Korstanje. 2019. "ANOVA's three types of estimating Sums of Squares: don't make the wrong choice!". *Towards Data Science, Medium* (2019). "<https://towardsdatascience.com/anovas-three-types-of-estimating-sums-of-squares-don-t-make-the-wrong-choice-91107c77a27a>"
- [51] Max Kuhn, Davis Vaughan, and RStudio. 2020. *parsnip: A Common API to Modeling and Analysis Functions*. (2020). "<https://parsnip.tidymodels.org/>"
- [52] Max Kuhn and Hadley Wickham. 2020. *Tidymodels: a collection of packages for modeling and machine learning using tidyverse principles*. "<https://www.tidymodels.org>"
- [53] Jiali Liu, Nadia Boukhelifa, and James R Eagan. 2019b. Understanding the Role of Alternatives in Data Analysis Practices. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 26, 1 (2019), 66–76.
- [54] Yang Liu, Tim Althoff, and Jeffrey Heer. 2019a. Paths Explored, Paths Omitted, Paths Obscured: Decision Points & Selective Reporting in End-to-End Data Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13602* (2019).
- [55] StataCorp LLC. 2020a. Language syntax. (2020). <https://www.stata.com/manuals13/u11.pdf>
- [56] StataCorp LLC. 2020b. Stata 16 Documentation. (2020). <https://www.stata.com/features/documentation/>
- [57] Arni Magnusson, Hans Skaug, Anders Nielsen, Casper Berg, Kasper Kristensen, Martin Maechler, Koen van Benthem, Ben Bolker, Nafis Sadat, Daniel Lüdtke, Russ Lenth, Joseph O'Brien, and Mollie Brooks. 2020. Package 'glimmTMB'. (2020). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/glimmTMB/index.html>"
- [58] Richard McElreath. 2020. *Statistical rethinking: A Bayesian course with examples in R and Stan*. CRC press.
- [59] Allen Newell, Herbert Alexander Simon, and others. 1972. *Human problem solving*. Vol. 104. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [60] Donald A Norman. 1986. Cognitive engineering. *User centered system design* 31 (1986), 61.
- [61] University of Amsterdam. 2020. JASP: A Fresh Way to do Statistics. (2020). "<https://jasp-stats.org/>"
- [62] Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, and others. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *the Journal of machine Learning research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [63] Josef Perktold, Skipper Seabold, Jonathan Taylor, and statsmodels developers. 2020. *Statsmodels v0.10.2 Reference Guide*. (2020). "<https://www.statsmodels.org/stable>"
- [64] Emil Persson, Erkin Asutay, Markus Heilig, Andreas Löfberg, Nancy Pedersen, Daniel Västfjäll, and Gustav Tinghög. 2019. Variation in the μ -Opioid Receptor Gene (OPRM1) Does Not Moderate Social-Rejection Sensitivity in Humans. *Psychological Science* 30, 7 (2019), 1050–1062.
- [65] M Pfannkuch. 1997. Statistical thinking: One statistician's perspective. *Research papers on stochastic education* (1997), 171–178.
- [66] Maxine Pfannkuch, Chris J Wild, and others. 2000. Statistical Thinking an Statistical Practice: Themes Gleaned from Professional Statisticians. *Statistical science* 15, 2 (2000), 132–152.
- [67] José Pinheiro, Douglas Bates, Saikat DebRoy, Deepayan Sarkar, EISPACK authors, Siem Heisterkamp, Bert Van Willigen, and R-core. 2020. Package 'nlme'. (2020). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlme/nlme.pdf>"
- [68] Peter Pirolli and Stuart Card. 2005. The sensemaking process and leverage points for analyst technology as identified through cognitive task analysis. In *Proceedings of international conference on intelligence analysis*, Vol. 5. McLean, VA, USA, 2–4.
- [69] Tanu N Prabhu. 2019. Top Python Libraries Used In Data Science. *Towards Data Science, Medium* (2019). "<https://towardsdatascience.com/top-python-libraries-used-in-data-science-a58e90f1b4ba>"
- [70] Brian Ripley, Bill Venables, Douglas M. Bates, Kurt Hornik, Albrecht Gebhardt, , and David Firth. 2020. Package 'MASS'. (2020). "<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MASS/MASS.pdf>"
- [71] Daniel M Russell, Mark J Stefik, Peter Pirolli, and Stuart K Card. 1993. The cost structure of sensemaking. In *Proceedings of the INTERACT'93 and CHI'93 conference on Human factors in computing systems*. ACM, 269–276.
- [72] SAS. 2020. JMP. (2020). "https://www.jmp.com/en_us/home.html"
- [73] Christian D Schunn and David Klahr. 1995. A 4-space model of scientific discovery. In *Proceedings of the 17th annual conference of the cognitive science society*. 106–111.
- [74] Christian D Schunn and David Klahr. 1996. When and how to go beyond a 2-space model of scientific discovery. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society: July 12-15, 1996, University of California, San Diego*, Vol. 18. Psychology Press, 25.
- [75] scikit-learn developers. 2020. *Scikit-Learn v0.23.2 Documentation*. (2020). "<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>"
- [76] Skipper Seabold and Josef Perktold. 2010. Statsmodels: Econometric and statistical modeling with python. In *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, Vol. 57. Scipy, 61.
- [77] IBM SPSS. SPSS Software. (????). <https://www.ibm.com/analytics/spss-statistics-software>
- [78] Stata. Stata Software. (????). <https://www.stata.com/>
- [79] Michael Suh. 2014. Higher Education, Gender & Work Dataset. (2014). "<https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/category/datasets/?download=20041>"
- [80] R Core Team and contributors worldwide. 2020. Package 'stats' v4.1.0. *CRAN* (2020). "<https://stat.ethz.ch/R-manual/R-devel/library/stats/html/00Index.html>"
- [81] Inc. The MathWorks. 2020a. Matlab. (2020). "<https://www.mathworks.com/>"

- [82] Inc. The MathWorks. 2020b. Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox. (2020). "<https://www.mathworks.com/help/stats/index.html>"
- [83] Nina Thigpen, Nathan M. Petro, Jessica Oswald, Klaus Oberauer, and Andreas Keil. 2019. Selection of Visual Objects in Perception and Working Memory One at a Time. *Psychological Science* 30, 9 (2019), 1259–1272.
- [84] Lea Verou, Tarfah Alrashed, and David Karger. 2018. Extending a Reactive Expression Language with Data Update Actions for End-User Application Authoring. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 379–387.
- [85] Chat Wacharamanatham, Krishna Subramanian, Sarah Theres Volkel, and Jan Borchers. 2015. Statsplorer: Guiding novices in statistical analysis. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 2693–2702.
- [86] Hadley Wickham, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy D’Agostino McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Golemund, Alex Hayes, Lionel Henry, Jim Hester, and others. 2019. Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4, 43 (2019), 1686.
- [87] Chris J Wild and Maxine Pfannkuch. 1999. Statistical thinking in empirical enquiry. *International statistical review* 67, 3 (1999), 223–248.
- [88] Kanit Wongsuphasawat, Yang Liu, and Jeffrey Heer. 2019. Goals, Process, and Challenges of Exploratory Data Analysis: An Interview Study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00568* (2019).
- [89] Anqing Zheng, Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, and Daniel A. Briley. 2019. National Gross Domestic Product, Science Interest, and Science Achievement: A Direct Replication and Extension of the Tucker-Drob, Cheung, and Briley (2014) Study. *Psychological Science* 30, 5 (2019), 776–788.