

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 minutuarization, 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, 221
 - 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

268

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

INDEX

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
 curriculum 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
- Psychology*, 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