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Thoroughness. See Completeness
Tips for article writing, 199–206
Titles, 37–39
importance of, 37–38
Tone, 53, 54–55
Top-down structure, for Results section, 123–125
Transitions, from literature review to present study, 50–51
Transition sentences, 12
Unexpected findings, reporting, 110
Validity
in arguments, 135–136
research designs and, 83–84
Value, in arguments, 135–136
Variables, ratio of cases to, 106–107
Verification, of conclusions, 115–116
Voice, 15–16
Warrants, in arguments, 135
214

INDEX

Within-participant experimental design, 90–93
Within-text citations, 48, 49
Wordiness, eliminating, 7
Word processors, limitations of, 11
World Wide Web references, 154–155
Writing quality. See also Style for Data Analysis section, 116

for Design section, 84–88
of introduction, 52–53
of literature reviews, 26–29
style and, 53
of theories and hypotheses, 60
tone and, 53, 54–55

Yoking, 91–92