

Index

- abstracts
 - elements of, 35
 - good features, 36
 - importance of, 33
 - length, 35
 - underspecified or overspecified, 36
- academic dishonesty, 125
- actual research-related strategy, 156
- ad hominem* attacks, 49, 162
- alliteration, 48
- altmetrics, 202, 242
- American Psychological Association, 184
- analysis of variance (ANOVA), 103, 104, 107
- analytic philosophy, 87–88
- analytical intelligence, 55
- Annual Review of Psychology*, 192
- APA Publication manual*, 3, 15, 36, 44, 112
- applicability, data analyses, 86
- argument, elements of, 113
- Article Publication Charge (APC), 240, 241
- ArXiv, 232
- Association for Psychological Science, 184
- attention span, and titles and abstracts, 33

- balanced arguments, 49
- Bayesian statistics, 87
 - approach, 87
 - classical inferential statistics, comparing and contrasting, 88
 - sample size, 226
 - uncertainty, 87
- Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and the Humanities, 239
- Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing, 239
- between-participant experimental designs, 73
- bibliometrics, 184
- BibMe, 128
- bioRxiv, 232

- blind review, 255
- Bonferroni corrections, 256
- Bower, Gordon, 170
- Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI), 239

- capitalizing on chance, 256
- catchy phrasing, 48
- cell means, 104, 105, 107
- cherry-picking, 227
- Child Development*, 192
- Child Development Perspectives*, 14
- Cinderella journals, 197
- citation counts, 161
 - distribution, 161
- Citation Machine, 128
- cited reference search, 123
- clarity, data analyses, 86
- classical inferential statistics, 87
 - Bayesian statistics, comparing and contrasting, 88
 - uncertainty, 87
- Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States (CHORUS), 209
- Clinical Psychology Review*, 41
- codebooks
 - output sharing, 231
- Cogent Social Sciences*, 194
- Cohen's *d*, standardized regression weights (betas), 107
- complex phrases and word constructions, 24
- confidence intervals, 95, 107
- confirmation bias, 137, 226
- confirmatory analyses, 221
- conflicts of interest
 - online submissions, 208
 - specifying, 255
- confounds, 72
- conjunction fallacy, 165
- CONSORT statement, 79

- contribution quality, 162
 contribution quantity, 162
 Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT), 207
 copyright, 214
 open access publication, and, 241
 correlational designs, 76
 counterintuitive findings, 165–166
 cover letter
 online submissions, 211
 previous reviews, information about, 189
 purpose of, 233
 review feedback, 213
 Creative Commons license, 214, 241
 creative intelligence, 55
 creative writing, opening paragraph and, 42
Current Contents, 33

 Darwin, Charles, 198
 data analyses, 82
 analytic philosophy, 87–88
 analytic techniques
 recommended practices, 91
 recording, 90
 capitalizing on chance, 256
 checking, 256
 conclusion, 95
 conducting, 82
 data preprocessing, 89–90
 data sharing, mandated, 92
 integrity, vouching for, 257
 low statistical power, 88
 philosophy of, 83
 and referees, 136
 report section, 85
 five subsections, 85
 principles, 86
 statistical significance
 effect sizes, 95
 multiple comparisons and, 93
 unethical practices, 93
 US National Institutes of Health guidelines, 84
 data collection and management, 79
 data mining. *See p-hacking*
 data papers, 93
 data preprocessing, 89–90
 databases, titles and abstracts and, 33
 debriefing, 79, 252
 Declaration of Helsinki, 208
 Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), 201
 descriptive statistics, 105
 design statements, verbosity versus clarity, 68
 desk rejection, 142
 journals and, 188
 online submissions, 212
 resubmission, 148

 development of new theory and arguments,
 16
Developmental Review, 18
 digital minituarization, 66
 direct maximum likelihood (DML) missing data
 imputation algorithms, 90
 direct quotations
 literature reviews, and, 45
 referencing, 124
 Directory of Open Access Journals, 240
 discussion section
 conclusion, 118
 critics of, 115
 and denouement, 113
 elements of, 112
 future directions subsection, 116–117
 implications subsection, 117
 limitations subsection, 159–161
 over-claiming and, 114
 as persuasive communication, 113
 principled argument, 114
 and readers, 112
 recap of material, 114
 and researchers, 112
 and self-promoting, 114
 structuring prior material, 114
 writing style, 117
 dispersion, 107
 dissertation trap, 137
 doi locator number, 127
 available, 127
 unavailable, 127
 double jeopardy, 251
 double-blinded peer review, 132
 duplicate submissions, online, 210

 Easy Bib, 128
 editorial board, reviewer part of, 154
 editors
 authors
 original work expected, 252
 respecting, 257
 and resubmissions, 251
 effect sizes, 95, 107
Elements of Style 2017, 3
 email, online submissions, 211
 revision instructions, 212
 empirical questions, 3
 empirical research
 and opening paragraph, 40–41
 EndNote, 128
 equal-odds rule, 162
 Erikson, Erik, 169
 ethical considerations
 authorship
 co-author permission for publication, 254

- credits and acknowledgments, 253
 - substantive contribution criteria, 254
- blind review, 255
- conflicts of interest, 255
- data
 - over-interpretation, avoiding, 257
 - vouching for integrity, 257
- data analyses
 - capitalizing on chance, 256
 - checking, 256
- data interpretation, honesty, 256
- funding, sources specified, 254
- informed consent and debriefing, compliance with, 252
- methods sections, details to enable replication, 255
- mistakes, admitting, 256
- online submissions, 208
- original submissions, not rewritings of past work, 252
- plagiarism, 253
- public view, checking rules, 257
- quotations and past work, permissions gained, 252
- reviewers, respect for, 257
- submitting to only one journal at a time, 251
- everyday experience, opening paragraph, and, 39
- exclusive license, 214
- expectation-maximization (EM) missing data imputation algorithms, 90
- explanatory hypotheses, 4
- external review, 7
- factor rotations, 256
- factorial experiments, 66
- faddish phraseology, 48
- faked data, 166
 - open access publication, 193, 245
 - vanity journals, publishing, 194
- False Discovery Rate (FDR), 94
- false-positive finding, 88
- Family-Wise Error Rate (FWER), 94
- feedback
 - actively soliciting, 157
 - evaluating, 157
 - future research, 163
 - limitations in study, 159–161
 - perseverance and continued publishing, 161
 - reacting adaptively, not personally, 162
 - self-assessments, 163
 - unintended inferences, 158
- file drawer problem, 222, 244
- file uploading, online submissions, 210
- first impressions, titles and abstracts, 34
- flat-out rejection, 142
 - resubmission, 148
- flexibility within fidelity, 50
- frequentist statistics, 87
- Freud, Sigmund, 169
- Frontiers in Psychology*, 193, 242, 247
 - publication criteria, 243
- F-statistics, 104
- funding
 - metascience, impact on, 84
 - sources specified, 254
- Gardner, Howard, 169
- general findings, constraints on, 231–232
- general journals, 192
- generality, data analyses, 86
- Ginsparg, Paul, 239
- GitHub, 227
- Gold Open Access, 241
- Gondourian Journal of Intercultural Experimental Psychology*, 239
- Gray, John, 198
- Green Open Access, 240
- HARKing, 93, 221, 227
- Harnad, Stevan, 239
- high-impact articles, 165
 - clear and compelling writing, 170
 - heuristic value for future research, 169–170
 - innovative and counterintuitive findings, 165–166
 - methodological innovation, 166
 - altering existing methods, 167
 - new methods, 167
 - practical significance of findings, 168–169
 - publishing strategies, and, 195
 - theoretical innovation, 167–168
- h-index list, 198
- hit rates, 196–198
 - multi-tasking, and, 199
 - undiscovered geniuses, 198
- hole in the literature, 120
- home runs, 197
- Human Development*, 18
- hypotheses, 46
 - article organized around, 61
 - clearly states, 60
 - confirmatory analyses, 61
 - future modifications, 62
 - results, relating back to, 62
 - study design, relationship between, 61
 - supported and non-supported
 - clearly stated, 61
 - measures of strength of effect, 61
 - theory, relationship between, 60

- ideal research-related strategy, 156
- impact factors, 184, 242
alternatives to, 201
calculating, 199
definition, 193
development, 199
problems with, 200
proxy judging tool, 199
- Implicit Association Test (IAT), 166
- inferential statistics, 105
confirmatory analyses, 221
- informed consent, 208, 252
- innovative findings, 165–166
- interactive review, 247
- introductions
direct quotations, avoiding, 45
drafting, 37
literature reviews, 42
coherent and integrated, 42
detail, 43
direct quotations, avoiding, 45
references, citing, 43–45
relevant features, 42
- opening paragraph
creative writing, 42
everyday experience, 39
history of research, 41
lack of empirical research, highlighting,
40–41
rhetorical question, 39
strategies, 38
striking facts or statistics, 40
two main purposes, 38
- page length, 47
- revision, 50
and specific purpose of study, 37
summary, 50
tone, 49
transition to present study, 45
final segment, 46
hypothesis for outcome, 46
research question, answering, 46
three aspects covered, 45
writing quality, 48
- JAMA Pediatrics*, 46
- jargon, 10–12
discussion section, 118
literature reviews, 24
- journal articles, referencing, 126
- journal cascade, 213
- Journal Impact Factors (JIFs). *See* impact factors
- Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 192
- Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 192
- Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 192
- Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 193
- Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4,
182, 183, 192
- journal selection, 181
breadth of topics, 182
keeping up to date, 183
many choices available, 190
personal factors
acceptance rate, 190
career stage, 189
curricular vita, evaluation, 190
quality and rigor of published papers, 183
readership
access to articles, 185
focused, 185
media team support, 186
- rejection
desk rejection, 188
rates, 188
requesting reviewers, 189
reviews from other journals, 188
- reputation and quality
connections with societies, 184
informal gradings, 183
objective metrics, 184
- style of writing and reporting, 182
- turnaround time, 186
examples, 187
reporting, 186
revision, impact on, 187
three forms, 186
type of, 182
- keywords, 34
- knowledge trap, 137
- Kroto, Harry, 198
- LaTeX, 205
- laundry lists, 44
- leading scenario, 39
- literature reviews. *See also* theory
characteristics, 14
clear language, 24
and direct quotations, 45
empirical literature
accuracy, 20
breadth, 19
conclusion, 22
inclusion of critique, 21
relevance, 20
five main types, 15–17
introductions, 42
coherent and integrated, 42

- detail, 43
 - references, citing, 43–45
 - relevant features, 42
 - journal selection, 17–18
 - meta-analyses, common errors, 25
 - other types, 17
 - quality of writing, 22
 - organization, 22
 - readers perspective, taking, 23
 - revision, 25
 - distance from paper, 26
 - feedback and criticism, arguing against, 27–28
 - reject-revise review, 26
 - summary, 28
 - summary of existing knowledge, 17
 - take-home message, 19
 - low statistical power, 88
- Manuscript Exchange Common Approach Project (MECA 2017), 214
- manuscripts
- acceptance criteria ratings, 18
 - data sharing, 92
 - manuscript-bloat, 69
 - page limits, 47
 - rejection. *See* rejection
 - results section, organizing, 108
 - review criteria, 28
 - rewriting. *See* rewriting
 - unsolicited, 194
- mathematical notation, 206
- mega-journals, 247
- Mendel, Gregor, 198
- Mendely, 202
- mental representations, 100
- meta-analyses, 15, 18
 - common errors, 25
- metacomments, 8
- metadata, online submissions, 209
- metascience, 84, 95
- methodological innovation, 166
 - altering existing methods, 167
 - new methods, 167
- methodology journals, 182
- methods section
- clarity, 68–69
 - compelling to reader, 70
 - comprehensiveness, 69–70
 - conclusion, 79
 - details to enable replication, 255
 - diverse and multifaceted, 66
 - effectiveness of, 67
 - explicit summary, 70
 - four components of studies, 66
 - importance of, 65, 66
- research design
- between-participant experimental designs, 73
 - confounds, eliminating, 72
 - correlational designs, 76
 - key elements, 73
 - measures, 79
 - mixed designs, 74
 - participants, 77–78
 - primary consideration, 77
 - procedures, 78–79
 - quasi-experiments, 75
 - random assignment of participants, 72
 - valid inference, 71
 - within-participant and mixed designs, 74
 - within-participant designs, 75
 - setting stage for results, 70
- Miller, George, 34
- missing data
- data analyses, 90
- mission statement, 139
- mixed designs, 74
- multiple imputation (MI) missing data
- imputation algorithms, 90
- multiple regression, 256
- name clutter, 44
- Nature*, 192, 196, 238
- needless words, discussion section, 117
- negative feedback, 157, 162
- non-equivalent control group design, 75
- normal science, 197
- one-tailed hypothesis tests, 223
- online submissions
- account required, 206
 - author information, 206–207
 - elements of, 204
 - file uploading, 210
 - formatting requirements and length
 - restrictions, 205
 - guidelines, review, 205
 - innovative registered reports, 206
 - innovative results-free review, 206
- journal policies
- duplicate submissions, 210
 - supplemental materials, 210
- manuscript information, 207
- peer review
- communication, 211
 - decision letter, 212
 - online submissions acceptance, 214–15
 - recordkeeping, 215

- online submissions (*cont.*)
 rejection, 213–214
 resubmission request, 212
 revision request, 212
 revision, resubmission, 213
 status of submission, 211
 triage, 212
 practice submissions, 204
 publishing policies, review, 205
 publishing terms, review, 205
 research information
 adherence to ethical considerations, 208
 conflicts of interest, 208
 funding, 208
 metadata, 209
 peer review process, author input, 209
 saving incomplete submissions, 204
 open (unblinded) peer review, 132
 open access publication
 beginnings of, 239
 benefits
 and copyright, 241
 and impact, 241
 speed, 242
 choice
 language factors, 238
 prestige, 238
 conclusions, 248
 faked data, 193, 245
 Green Open Access, 240
 journal reach, 185
 journals, publications fee, 215
 models, 240
 quality issues, 245
 interactive review, 247
 predatory publishers, 245
 referee expertise, 246
 review process, 242–244
 vanity journals, 193
 open peer review, 210
 Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID),
 207
 open science
 advantages, 220
 credibility
 boosting, 234
 and confidence, 220
 versus new discovery, 235
 disadvantages, 220
 errors, uncovering, 234
 general findings, constraints on, 231–232
 journal practices, 215
 output sharing, 229
 codebooks, 231
 codes and scripts, 231
 data, 230
 materials, 229
 privacy concerns, 230
 practices, 234
 preprints, 232
 preregistration
 collaboration with colleagues, 224
 confirmatory analyses, 221
 eliminating, 222
 file drawer problem, 222
 items included, 222
 minor deviations, 226
 one-tailed hypothesis tests, 223
 primary goal, 221
 privacy, 223
 registered report, 223
 standard operating procedures (SOPS), 223
 unregistered analyses, 227–229
 printed journals, limitations of, 219
 revisions, 233
 sample size, 224
 Bayesian statistics, 226
 equivalence testing, 226
 post-hoc power analysis, 226
 previous publications, based on, 225
 result not statistically significant, 226
 sequential analysis, 225
 smallest effect size of interest (SESOI), 225
 statistical power, 224, 226
 submissions, 233
 and bias, 233
 useful to future researchers, 220
 opening paragraph
 creative writing, 42
 everyday experience, 39
 history of research, 41
 lack of empirical research, highlighting,
 40–41
 rhetorical question, 39
 strategies, 38
 striking facts or statistics, 40
 two main purposes, 38
 opinion and perspectives journals, 182
 page length, introductions, 47
 parallel construction, 9–10
 paraphrasing, 125
 Pearson, Karl, 166
 peer review, 131
 attacks on, 151
 complete objectivity appraising, 156
 criticism, authors unable to accept, 131
 online submissions
 acceptance, 214–215
 communication, 211
 decision letter, 212
 recordkeeping, 215

- rejection, 213–214
 - resubmission request, 212
 - revision request, 212
 - revision, resubmission, 213
 - status of submission, 211
 - triage, 212
 - online submissions, author input, 209
 - open, 210
 - three common methods
 - advantages and disadvantages, 132
 - descriptions, 132
 - personal statements, 49
 - Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18
 - Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 182
 - p*-hacking, 93, 147, 221, 225, 227, 256
 - piecemeal publication, 147
 - plagiarism, 120, 124, 125, 253
 - software detection tools, 128
 - PLoS One*, 193
 - publication criteria, 243
 - positive feedback, 157
 - post-hoc power analysis, 226
 - post-publication review, 210
 - practical intelligence, 56
 - practical significance of findings, 168–169
 - predatory publishers, 245
 - preprints, 232
 - primary sources, 125
 - privacy, output sharing, 230
 - probes for suspicion, 79
 - Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 192, 193, 196
 - proofreading
 - authors, reasons for not doing, 133
 - referees, and, 132
 - PsyArXiv, 232
 - Psychological Bulletin*, 14, 18, 28, 182, 192
 - Psychological Methods*, 182
 - Psychological Review*, 18, 182, 192
 - publication criteria, 244
 - Psychological Science*, 182, 183
 - Psychological Science in the Public Interest (PSPI)*, 194
 - Psychometrika*, 4
 - psychosocial theory of development, 169
 - Psycology*, 239
 - publication bias, 225, 244
 - Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. *See* *APA Publication manual*
 - publishing agreement, 214
 - publishing strategies, 195
 - hit rates, 196–198
 - multi-tasking, and, 199
 - undiscovered geniuses, 198
 - impact factors
 - alternatives to, 201
 - calculating, 199
 - definition, 193
 - development, 199
 - problems with, 200
 - proxy judging tool, 199
 - selected high-impact articles, 195
 - subjective indices, and, 195
 - PubMed, 240
 - PubMed Central, 208
 - p*-values, 93, 104, 109, 221
 - quantitative psychology, 92
 - quasi-experiments, 66, 75
 - quotations
 - direct, 45, 124
 - permissions, gaining, 252
 - R Markdown, 205
 - random assignment of participants, 72
 - recent reference, 123
 - recordkeeping, online submissions, 215
 - referees
 - authors respecting, 257
 - blind review, 255
 - citing likely referees, 134
 - clear explanations, 137
 - conclusions follow on from data, 136
 - data analyses and interpretations, checking, 136
 - double jeopardy, 251
 - and editors, 138
 - lack of substance, 135
 - limitations, making clear, 138
 - and literature reviews, 56
 - objections to data, anticipating, 137
 - open access publication
 - criteria, 243
 - interactive review, 247
 - public identification, 247
 - quality issues, 246
 - organize article around problem, 134
 - outside colleague reading article, 134
 - peer review. *See* peer review
 - personality clashes, 138
 - scholarship, 135
 - selling out, 131, 139
 - work building on others, 135
 - writing for audience, 139
 - writing with referees in mind, 132
- referencing
 - alphabetical order, 126
 - blueprint for future studies, 121
 - cited reference search, 123
 - citing, 43–45
 - correct citations, 126
 - digital documentation tools, 128
 - doi locator number, 127

- referencing (*cont.*)
 available, 127
 unavailable, 127
 hole in the literature, finding, 120
 journal articles, 126
 online and no doi locator number, 127
 only works cited, 125
 recent reference, 123
 respect for fellow researchers, 121
 what, 123–125
 when, 123
 where, 126–128
 who, 122
- registered reports, 206, 223, 234
- rejection
 conclusion, 152
 desk rejection, 142, 148
 journals and, 188
 five stages of dealing
 acceptance, 145
 anger, 144
 bargaining, 145
 denial, 144
 depression, 145
 flat-out rejection, 142
 resubmission, 148, 150
 journals
 rates, 188
 requesting reviewers, 189
 reviews from other journals, 188
 by multiple journals, 151
 online submissions
 journal cascade, 213
 Manuscript Exchange Common Approach
 Project (MECA 2017), 214
 rebutting, 213
 reacting to, 143
 reasons for
 boring or incomprehensible, 146
 incremental contribution only, 147
 literature missed, 147
 missing conceptual view held by reviewer
 and not included, 154
 no significant contribution made, 145
 specific circumstances, 147
 resubmitting
 flat-out rejection, 148
 new journal, informing editor, 149
 online submissions, 212
 response to reviewers, 150
 technical, 150
 triage rejection, 148
 revise-and-resubmit, 143, 150
 and scepticism, 141
 technical rejection, resubmission, 150
- reject-revise review, 26
 repetition, 9–10
 replicability of research, 121
 replication crisis, 151
 repository-deposit systems, 215
 research, identity of all relevant work not
 known, 155
 research design
 between-participant experimental designs, 73
 confounds, eliminating, 72
 correlational designs, 76
 key elements, 73
 measures, 79
 mixed designs, 74
 participants, 77–78
 procedures, 78–79
 quasi-experiments, 75
 valid inference, 71
 within-participant and mixed designs, 74
 within-participant designs, 75
 research funding, and online submissions, 208
 research history, and opening paragraph, 41
 research methods. *See* methods section
 researcher degrees of freedom, 147
 responsible referees, 247
 restructuring, 8
 results
 hypotheses, relating back to, 62
 theory, supporting or not supporting, 62
 results section
 central findings first, 101
 dispersion, 107
 manuscript organization, 108
 order consistent with introduction and
 methods sections, 102
 prose style, 103–105
 statistical procedures and tests, justifying,
 105–106
 statistics, reporting, 108
 summary, 110
 table of correlations, 106
 telling a good story, 100
 top-down structure, 102–103
 results-free review, 206
retractions.com, 195
 review
 author requesting specific reviewers, 189
 blind review, 255
 interactive review, 247
 open access publication, 242–244
 post-publication, 210
 registered reports, 206, 223, 234
 results-free, 206
 review journals, 182
 revise-and-resubmit rejection, 143, 150

- revision
 - introductions, 50
 - online submissions, 212
 - and open science principles, 233
- rewriting, 6
 - compulsiveness and attention to detail, 7
 - external review, 7
 - restructuring, 8
- rhetorical question, and opening paragraph, 39
- scholarship, 135
- Science*, 4, 192, 196, 238
- Scientific American*, 192
- scientific process, 141
- Sci-Hub, 249
- secondary sources, 125
- self-assessments, 163
- self-plagiarism, 253
- self-reference, 12
- sequential analysis, 225
- significance testing, 61
- simplicity, data analyses, 86
- single-blinded peer review, 132
- skepticism, 141
- Smallest Effect Size of Interest (SESOI), 225
- SocArXiv, 232
- software and toolboxes, 91
- Spearman, Charles, 166
- specialty journals, 192
- specific reading comprehension disability, 159–161
- SSRN, 232
- standard deviation, 107
- standard operating procedures (SOPs), 223
- standardized betas, 107
- statistical power, sample size, 224, 226
- statistical significance
 - effect sizes, 95
 - and multiple comparisons, 93
- statistics
 - Bayesian, 87
 - approach, 87
 - classical inferential, comparing and contrasting, 88
 - sample size, 226
 - uncertainty, 87
 - classical inferential, 87
 - Bayesian, comparing and contrasting, 88
 - uncertainty, 87
 - confirmatory analyses, 221
 - descriptive statistics, 105
 - frequentists, 87
 - inferential, 105
 - confirmatory analyses, 221
 - results section, 108
 - statistics-based prose, 104
 - stepwise multiple regression, 256
 - strength of effect, 61
 - striking facts or statistics, and opening paragraph, 40
 - study design, relationship between hypotheses, 61
 - study-reporting journals, 182
 - subliminal pedagogy, 5
 - submissions
 - online. *See* online submissions
 - open science principles
 - and bias, 233
 - cover letter, 233
 - ten final tips and advice, 261–265
 - successful intelligence, 55, 58, 59, 60
 - summaries, and titles and abstracts, 33
 - supplemental materials, online submissions, 210
 - Supplemental Online Materials (SOM), 69
 - table of correlations, 106
 - tacit knowledge, 154
 - take-home message, 19
 - target audience, 4
 - technical rejection, resubmission, 150
 - technical terms, 10–12
 - theoretical innovation, 167–168
 - theory, 54. *See also* literature review
 - clearly stated, 55–56
 - disconfirmable, 58
 - existence of, 54
 - function explained, 58
 - future modifications, 62
 - hypotheses, relationship between, 60
 - multiple or single, 57
 - prior evidence supporting, 59
 - relevance, citing, 56
 - results, supporting or not supporting, 62
 - source, citing, 56
 - testing against competing theories, 59
 - use in past research, 56
 - theory integration/testing, 16
 - theory journals, 182
 - theory knitting, 57
 - theory of multiple intelligences, 169
 - theory testing, 16
 - titles
 - importance of, 33
 - informative versus catchy, 35
 - self-explanatory, 34
 - styles, 34
 - tone, introductions, 49

274

Transparency and Openness Promotion
 Guidelines, 234
transparent science. *See* open science
Trends in Cognitive Science, 192
triage rejection, 142
 online submissions, 212
 resubmitting, 148
triarchic theory, 168
t-tests, 221
Turnitin.com, 128

undiscovered geniuses, 198
unregistered analyses, 227–229
unsolicited manuscripts, 194
US data analyses, recommendations about, 84
US National Institutes of Health, data analyses
 guidelines, 84

INDEX

valid inference, 71
vanity journals, 193
 faked data, publishing, 194
voice, 12

Western, educated, independent, rich, and
 democratic (WEIRD) sample data, 115
within-participant and mixed designs, 74
within-participant designs, 75
word processors, 8
writing quality, introductions, 48
writing techniques
 clarity
 organization, 5
 simple and direct, 5
 summary, 173–180