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Quantitative research methods in applied linguistics are currently undergoing a period of major reform. There are several causes or conditions that have led us here. For one, as the field began to apply meta-analysis in the last two decades as a means to understand empirical evidence in its aggregate form, many syntheses uncovered—whether by design or more incidentally—methodological challenges facing individual substantive domains. Developing alongside such observations is a growing set of tools for empirical examinations of 'study quality' (see e.g., Plonsky, 2013; Paquot & Plonsky, 2017), which had hitherto been largely assumed or de-emphasized in favor of theoretical and/or practical concerns. An enhanced awareness of methodological practices could also, rather simply, be argued to be a natural consequence of our maturity as an academic discipline (e.g., Marsden & Plonsky, 2018; Ortega, 2005).

Regardless of its origins, evidence of this movement can be observed in many distinct settings and venues. As we might expect, important steps have been taken by academic journals in the form of editorials (e.g., Trofimovich & Ellis, 2015), revised author guidelines (e.g., Norris, Plonsky, Ross, & Schoonen, 2015), and new procedures for and indicators of 'open science' (Marsden, Morgan-Short, Trofimovich, & Ellis, 2018). The movement is also manifesting itself through a variety of other activities both within learner corpus research (LCR) and adjacent domains. These include (a) workshops/bootcamps and methodologically oriented symposia, (b) studies of methodological literacy/training (e.g., Gonulal, Loewen, & Plonsky, 2017), (c) a newly added Research Methods strand at AAAL, (d) novel analytical techniques (e.g., bootstrapping in Gries, 2006, 2013; Bayesian data analysis in Norouzian, de Miranda, & Plonsky, 2018); and (e) methodological syntheses seeking to describe and evaluate research and reporting practices (e.g., Marsden, Thompson, & Plonsky, 2018). Paquot and Plonsky (2017), for instance, systematically reviewed 66 methodological features in a sample of 376 LCR studies. The results revealed a number of inconsistencies and infelicities ranging from corpus design and sampling to statistical analyses and data reporting practices. However, there is limited evidence that LCR has fully embraced the need for a number of changes necessary to maximize its potential for improving our understanding of L2 development, knowledge, and use.

This paper begins with an overview of the methodological reform movement taking place in applied linguistics, highlighting the notion of study quality and the motivations behind open science. The discussion will then apply these principles to LCR, exploring challenges and opportunities unique to the domain. Suggestions will also be put forth toward an agenda of methodologically-oriented work at the intersection of LCR and methodological reform.
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