

INDEX

- Abramowitz, C. V., 64
- Abramowitz, S. I., 64
- abstracts
 - declining readability of, 67
 - guidelines for writing, 121–123
 - structured abstracts, standard for, 149
- academic success
 - research funding linked to, 61, 72–74
- achievement motivation
 - scientific research and, 91–92
- ad hominem argument
 - advocacy and, 56–57
 - avoidance of, 155–156
- advertisements
 - misleading statistical significance in, 64–70
 - quasi-experiments on persuasion
 - effects of, 37–38
- advocacy
 - ad hominem and authority arguments and, 56–57
 - avoiding rejection, 52
 - causal variables, ignoring of, 53–54
 - ex ante predictive validity, tests of, 52–53
 - faulty logic and, 56
 - favorable evidence bias and, 50–51
 - government research funding and, 79–81, 165
 - ignoring cumulative knowledge and, 51–52
 - machine learning models and, 54–56
 - objectivity *vs.*, 59, 166
 - prevalence and acceptance of, 57–59
 - by reviewers and editors, 63–64
 - in scientific research, 48–50, 143, 164–169
- age of scientists
 - productivity and, 97–98
- air pollution research
 - advocacy linked to government
 - funding of, 79–81
- Al-Ubaydli, O., 64
- American Academy of Implant Dentistry, 86–87
- American Journal of Epidemiology*, 69–70
- American Journal of Public Health*
 - papers rejected by, 65–66
- American Political Science Review*
 - papers rejected by, 65–66
- American Psychological Association (APA)
 - publication assessment by, 31–32
- American Psychologist*
 - unreliability of reviews in, 65
- Anderson, R. G., 39

202 / Index

- Annals of Emergency Medicine*
 failure of error identification in, 63
Annals of Internal Medicine, 63–64
 annual reports of scientific findings, 146
 anti-inflammatory drugs
 skepticism concerning research on, 107–108
APA Publication Manual, 149
 Arctic expeditions
 public *vs* private funding and outcomes of, 82
 Aristotle, 10–11, 16–17, 22–23, 52, 56–57
 Arkes, Hal, 104–105
 ARRIVE guidelines, 30
Arrowsmith (Lewis), 96
 Asch, S. E., 95–98
 “Aunt Mary Test”
 for new ideas, 104–105
 Australia
 research ethics in, 84–85
 authority argument
 advocacy and, 56–57
 “Author’s Formula”
 for publishing success, 61–62
 authors of published research
 challenges to prior findings, criticism of writings, 51, 64
 checklist for writing, 121–128
 false criticism of, 63–64
 previous contributions, importance of, 70, 140
- Babbage, Charles, 42
 Bacon, Francis, 22–23, 47–48, 139
 bafflegab
 published research and, 66–68
 Bar-Anan, Y., 32–33
 Barber, B., 95–98
 Baron, R. S., 114–116
 Baumeister, R. F., 92–95
 BCG matrix, 30
 Beach, L. R., 49–50
 Beaman, A. L., 109–111
 Beardsley, M. C., 22–23
Behavioural and Brain Sciences
 review reliability in, 65
 beliefs
 objectivity *vs*, 44–46
 Bell, Alexander Graham, 124
 benefits of research
 absence of duress or deceit and, 106–107
 Benford’s Law, 152–153
 Berscheid, E., 114–116
 biased decision-making
 bias in research on, 49–50
 big data research
 limitations of, 54–56
 biographies of scientists, 96
 Bitcoin
 pricing model for, 54–56
 Blass, T., 109–114
 books, research publication in, 133
 Boone, A. L., 92–95
 Boston Consulting Group, 30
 Boylan, J. B., 35–36
 Boyle, Robert, 12–13, 17–18
 brainstorming
 in scientific research, 102–103
 brainwriting, 102–103
 Brazis, K. L., 64
 Brief Self-Control Scale (BSCS), 92–95
British Medical Journal
 rejection of papers by, 65–66
 Brush, S. G., 76
 bureaucratization
 scientific research and, 166–167
 Burt, Cyril, 40, 42
 Bush, Vannevar, 75–78
- Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, 44–46
 Campbell, D. T., 20
 Campbell’s Law, 5–7
 causal variables
 impact on research of, 53–54
 causality
 evidence on, 118–119
 experiments and, 20

203 / Index

- Ceci, S. J., 65
 Cecil, S., 86
 Cerf, C., 3–5
Certification of Compliance with APA Ethical Principles, 150–151
 Chamberlin, T. C., xii, 14–17
 cheating in research, 40–42
 oaths linked to reduction in, 151–152
 replication to confirm, 108
 checklists for the scientific method.
 See also Compliance With Science Checklist
 Brief Self-Control Scale and, 92–95
 data analysis, 106–119
 data collection, 117–119
 designing studies and, 109–117
 development of, 2, 24–28
 lack of compliance with, 30
 limitations of, 29–30
 mandated checklists, 8–9
 problem selection checklist, 105–109
 scientific papers checklist, 121–128
 self-assessment checklist for self-control, 94–95
 cherry-picking results, 41
 Chevassus-Au-Louis, N., 40, 166–167
 Christensen-Szalanski, J. J. J., 49–50
 Christian, L. M., 118–119
 Cialdini, R. B., 133
 Cicchetti, D. V., 65
 citation analysis
 coercive citation and, 64
 complexity of writing linked to increased citations, 67–68
 dissemination of papers and, 134–135
 evidence by citation, 50–51
 failure of error identification in, 63
 historical evolution of, 6–7
 justified citations in published research, 150–151
 search for relevant papers using, 109–111
 snowballing in, 32–33
 verification of citations in papers, 125–126
 “Clever Hans” experiment, 111–113
Clinical vs Statistical Prediction (Meehl), 140–141
 coercive citation
 confirmation bias and, 64
 Cole, S., 97–98
 comparative drug testing
 misconceptions of statistical significance in, 69–70
 complexity
 proliferation of, 16–17
 writing clarity *vs*, 66–68
 compliance with science
 in published research, 109–111
Compliance With Science Checklist
 access to copies of, 121–123
 applications for, 25–28
 Checklist 1, 26–28, 140–141, 146, 156–161
 Checklist 2, 94–95, 140
 Checklist 3, 100–102, 157–158
 Checklist 4, 106–120
 Checklist 5, 121–128
 Checklist 6, 122–129
 Checklist 7, 128
 Checklist 8, 137–138
 Checklist 9, 137–138
 Checklist 10, 149
 development of, 2, 24–28
 hiring scientists using, 140
 identification of published papers using, 158–159
 media coverage of research and, 162–163
 problem identification, 100–102
 published research using, 109–111
 review structure using, 156–157
 statement of compliance with, 124–125
 computational data
 inconsistent results in, 35–36
 confidentiality in research
 benefits and limitations of, 85

204 / Index

- confirmation bias, 47–48
 - among peer reviewers, 64
 - meta-analysis identification of, 109–111
- conflict research
 - intergroup dynamics in, 80–81
 - role-playing in, 115–116
- consent forms
 - impact on scientific research of, 83–84
- CONSORT practice guidelines, 7–8
- construct validity
 - extensions assessment of, 37
- consumer behavior
 - experimental design of consumer satisfaction surveys, 20–21
 - journal research impact on predictions of, 33–34
 - replication reversal in “too-many-choices” research, “too-many-choices,” 36
- content checklist for scientific papers, 25–28, 121–128
- contracts with scientists, 142
- controlled experiments, 18
- control over research
 - design for retention of, 113
 - funding and, 101–109
- Cook, T. D., 20
- copyrights on scientific papers, 125–126, 132–133
- Corey, M., 114–116
- cost–benefit analysis
 - effect size in research and, 153
- court system, 167–169
 - compliance with science and, 161
- creativity
 - brainstorming and, 102–103
 - fostering of, 144–146
- credibility of findings
 - in scientific papers, 121–123
- Crichton, M., 67, 121–123
- The Cult of Statistical Significance: How the Standard Error Costs Us Jobs, Justice and Lives* (Ziliak & McCloskey), 68–70
- cumulative scientific knowledge. *See also* prior knowledge
 - data analysis incorporation of, 106–119
 - designing research based on, 109–111
 - discussion in papers of, 124–125
 - ignoring past results of, 51–52
- current solutions
 - as hypotheses, 100–103
 - solution development and disregard of, 103
- Czerlinski, J., 16
- Darsee, John, 41–42
- Darwin, Charles, 18–19, 89–90
- data
 - analysis checklist, 106–119
 - collection checklist for, 117–119
 - disclosure of, 151
 - fabrication of, 42
 - inconvenient data access, 100–103
 - nonexperimental data, 21
 - replications of, 124–125
 - validity and reliability of, 15–16, 117–119, 124–125
- data quality
 - replication of research and impact of, 39
- Daubert standard, 7–8, 161
- Daubert v. Merrell Dow* case, 7–8
- Davis, J., 79–81
- Deci, E. L., 144–146
- decision-making
 - biases in, 49–50
 - journal papers’ impact on, 33–34
 - misconceptions of statistical significance as harm in, 69–70
- decomposition principle
 - scientific checklist development and, 24–25
- demographic diversity
 - equity research on, 80–81
 - grievance studies of, 80–81
 - impact on research of participation targets, 72–74, 76

- Dermer, M., 114–116
- designing research
- checklist for, 109–117
 - consumer satisfaction surveys, 20–21
 - economics studies, xii–xiii
 - effect directions and sizes and, 116–117
 - experimental study designs, 20
 - multiple hypotheses and, xiv, 111–113
 - objective design, 14–15
 - pretesting of experiments and, 109–114
 - prior knowledge incorporation into, 109–111
 - risk of harm, minimization of, 113
 - role-playing experiments, 114–116
 - shared experimental design, 101–105
 - simplicity in, xiii–xiv
 - warnings to subjects and, 114
- Dewald, W. G., 39
- Diamond, J., 19–20
- Dillman, D. A., 118–119
- direct replications
- failure of disclosure and undermining of, 38–40
 - of scientific research, 35–36
 - similarity of findings in, 37
- disclosure
- in published research, 150–151
 - publishers' requirement for, 150–151
 - replication undermined by failure of, 38–40
- dissemination of scientific knowledge
- checklist for publishing scientific findings, 128
 - direct communication of findings, 132–135
 - guidelines for, 128–137
 - scientific papers as tool for, 121–128
 - talks and presentations, 137–138
 - useful knowledge dissemination, 146–147
- Dockery, D. W., 79–81
- doctoral students in science
- importance of research for, 98
- doctrine of economy (Pierce), 111–113
- double-blind peer review
- limitations of, 70
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, 118–119
- drafts of research
- retention of, 111, 124–125
- drug studies
- misconceptions of statistical significance in, 69–70
 - skepticism concerning, 107–108
- Ducoin, et al. v. Viamonte Ros, et al.*, 86–87
- Duhem-Quine problem, 22
- Dunning, T., 20
- duress
- advocacy-based revisions as, 63–64
- Dyson, Freeman, 96
- Eastman Kodak, 166–167
- Eberharter, V., 42–43
- economic development
- research funding impact on, 75–76
- economics research
- damage of statistical significance testing in, 69
 - experimental studies in, 38
 - skepticism in, 96
 - suppression of research that challenges status quo, 64
- The Economist*, 5–7
- economy, Pierce's doctrine of, 111–113
- Eddington, 18–19
- Edison, Thomas, 88, 90–91
- editing guidelines for scientific papers, 123
- editors of journals, 155
- advocacy by, 63–64
- effect size and direction
- agreement of findings with, 37
 - cost-benefit implications and, 153
 - design of experiments and, 116–117
 - practical importance of, 106–119
 - in replications, 37
- Ehrenberg-Bass Institute, 143–144
- Einhorn, P., 54–56

206 / Index

- Einstein, Albert, 18–19, 90–91
- Eisenhower, Dwight D., 76–77
- English Agricultural Revolution, 14–15
- entrepreneurship
 - scientific research skills and, 90–91, 141
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 79–81
- environmental research
 - advocacy linked to government-funded research, 79–81
 - false conclusions in, 38
 - non-experimental data in, 21
- Epstein, D., 88
- errors in published research
 - dichotomization errors in statistics, 69–70
 - failure of error identification in, 63
 - focus on as barrier to usefulness assessment, 62
 - multiple hypotheses and, 111–113
 - post-publication correction of, 133–138
- escalation bias in investment decisions
 - replication reversal of research on, 36
- ethics in research
 - design for, 113
 - government requirements for, 84–85
 - guidelines concerning, 133–138
- evaluations
 - of scientific papers, 126–127
 - solution development and avoidance of, 105
- Evans, J. A., 81–82
- evidence
 - by citation, 50–51
 - Daubert standard for, 7–8, 161
 - favorable evidence bias, 50–51
 - skepticism of scientists about, 95–98, 107–108
 - substantive findings relevant to, presentation in papers, 125–126
 - suppression of evidence that challenges research, 51, 64
- evolutionary theory
 - experiments in research on, 18
- ex-ante predictive validity
 - prospect theory testing of, 52–53
- exercise
 - scientific skills development and, 100–102
- Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference* (Shadish, Cook & Campbell), 20
- experimental research
 - consent forms and, 83–84
 - design of, 20
 - meta-analyses of, 20–21
 - opinions *vs.*, 65
 - pretesting of experiments, 109–114
 - relevant existing papers on, 109–111
 - role-playing experiments, 114–116
 - scientific method and, 17–22
 - seeking predictions in, 101–105
 - skepticism in, 95–98, 107–108
 - types of, 18
 - validity of, 38
 - warnings to subjects and, 114
- expert judgments
 - misconceptions in, 4–5
 - quantitative models *vs.*, 130
- The Experts Speak: A Definitive Compendium of Authoritative Misinformation* (Cerf & Navasky), 4
- extensions
 - importance of, 108
 - of scientific research, 35–36
 - validity of findings using, 34–35
- fabrication in research
 - in advocacy papers, 80–81
 - Benford's Law, 152–153
 - data on, 41–42
- face-to-face discussions
 - limitations of, 134–135

207 / Index

- false criticisms
 - authors' encounters with, 63–64
 - research benefits and avoidance of, 106–107
- Faraday, Michael, 89–90, 96
- Farnsworth, Filo, 90–91
- favorable hypothesis bias
 - meta-analysis identification of, 109–111
- fictitious contact information
 - fraudulent reviews and, 66–68
- Fidler, F., 148–149
- financial journals
 - complexity of writing in, 67–68
- Fire, M., 6–7
- Flesch-Kincaid Index
 - complexity of writing, 67–68
- Flyvbjerg, B., 36–37
- “Forecasting methods and principles: Evidence-based checklists” (Armstrong & Green), 130
- forecasting research
 - invited papers in, 153–154
 - predictive validity of combined forecasts, 70
 - seeking predictions in, 101–105
- Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), 142
- Francis, B., 80–81
- Franklin, Benjamin, 5, 128, 166–167
- Fraud in the Lab* (Chevassus-Au-Louis), 40
- fraudulent reviews
 - of published research, 66–68
- freedom of speech and thought
 - creativity and, 144–146
 - scientific research and, 86–87, 124–125
 - at universities, 142–144
- Free Speech Union (FSU) (U.K.), 142
- Frey, B. S., 22–23, 65, 80–81, 155
- Friedman, M., 109–111
- Friedman, Milton, 16, 72, 126–127, 164
- Frye Standard for scientific evidence, 7–8
- full disclosure
 - government reluctance concerning, 83
 - importance of, xiii
 - publishers' requirement for, 150–151
 - scientific method and, 14
- funding for research. *See also*
 - government involvement in research
 - academic success linked to, 61
 - acknowledgment in papers of, 127–132
 - control over studies and, 101–109
 - postwar growth of government funding, 61, 76–77
 - reform and reduction of government involvement in, 160–161
- Gagne, M., 144–146
- Gal, D., 56
- Galileo, 40, 86–87
- Galton, Francis, 89–98
- game theory
 - forecasting research and, 101–105
 - skepticism concerning, 107–108
- Gans, J. S., 64
- Gao, F., 79–81
- Garfield, Eugene, 6–7
- Garvey, W. D., 65–66
- Gender, Place and Culture* journal, 80–81
- general mental ability (GMA)
 - hiring criteria for scientists and, 139–141
 - scientific research and importance of, 88–89
- Gigerenzer, Gerd, 16–17, 31–32, 50, 69, 133
- Gold Open Access, 134
- Goldstein, D. G., 16
- Gomes, B., 64
- Goodstein, J., 67–68
- Goodstein, L. D., 64
- Goodwin, P., 35–36
- Google Scholar, 132
 - citations analysis on, 6–7, 36, 50–51
- Gould, S. J., 19

208 / Index

- Governing the Commons* (Ostrom), 117
 Government Accounting Office (GAO)
 grant proposal improvements from, 79–81
 government involvement in research
 advocacy linked to, 79–81, 164–169
 consent forms, 83–84
 grant applications linked to student
 loans and college programs, 72–74
 group-based research funding, 81–82
 institutional review boards and ethics
 committees, 84–85
 military research, university research
 funding and, 61
 reform and reduction of involvement, 160–161
 regulation of scientific research and, 83–87
 scientific practice and, 72–87
 speech restriction and self-censorship
 and, 86–87, 143–144
 university research and, 72–74
 GRADE practice guidelines, 7–8
 grant applications
 academic encouragement of, 72–74
 GAO recommended improvements
 for, 79–81
 group-based research funding, 81–82
 Green, Paul, 6–7
 Green Open Access, 134
 grievance studies
 advocacy-based funding for, 80–81
 Griffin, E., 86
 Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
 research and development spending
 share of, 76–77
 group-based research
 brainstorming and, 102–103
 government funding preferences for, 81–82
 problem-solving discussions, 104–105
 social loafing in, 102
 Guestrin, C., 6–7
 gun control research
 effect size and direction in, 116–117
Happiness: A Revolution in Economics
 (Frey), 80–81
 Hardin, Garrett, 117
 HARKing (hypothesizing after results are
 known), 41
 harm in research
 design-based minimization of, 113
 Hartley, J., 149
 Harvard Open Access Project, 134
 Harvard University, 85
 Hauer, E., 83
 Hayek, Friedrich von, 2, 20, 163
 head injuries
 skepticism concerning research on, 107–108
 heredity
 research skills and, 89–90
 “hiding hand” study of public works
 reversal of findings in replication of, 36–37
 Higgins, E. T., 56
 hiring of scientists
 guidelines for, 139–142
 hiring quotas
 avoidance of, 141
 Hirschman, A. O., 36–37
 Hoffman, L. R., 105
 Hogarth, R. M., 16, 155
 Hollingworth, H. L., 14
 Holub, H. W., 42–43
 Hooke, Robert, 17–18
 hospital procedures research
 checklist applications in, 7–9, 83–84
 Hubbard, R., 32–35, 39–40
 humor in advertising
 extension failures in research on, 37
 Hunter, J. E., 109–111
 hypotheses
 advocacy and, 48–49
 avoiding rejection of, 52
 current solutions as basis for, 100–103
 effect size and direction and, 116–117
 favorable evidence bias, 50–51
 logical conclusions and, 22–23

209 / Index

- prior hypotheses, inclusion in papers of, 123
 - registration of hypotheses, 111
 - scientific method, 10–11
- impartiality
 - in scientific research, 100–109
- independent work
 - as scientists' research skill, 102
 - solution development and, 103
- industrial research and development
 - deregulation impact on, 85–86
 - private funding of, 77–78
- inequality
 - advocacy-based research on, 80–81
- Infectious Diseases Society of America, 85–86
- Influence* (Cialdini), 133
- informed consent
 - impact on scientific research of, 83–84
- Institutional Review Blog*, 85
- Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)
 - government requirements for, 84–85
 - speech restriction and self-censorship and, 86–87
- integrity tests
 - hiring of scientists and, 140
- intergroup conflict research, 80–81
- International Journal of Forecasting*, 121–123
- Internet
 - cheating detection and, 40
 - dissemination of scientific papers and, 134–135
 - open peer review on, 155–156
 - publishing papers on, 130–131
 - search for evidence on, 109–111
- intrinsic motivation in research
 - impact on outcomes of, 91–92, 144–146
- investment management
 - checklist limitations in, 30
- Ioannidis, John, 31–32, 64
- IronLawofRegulation.com* website, 85–86
- Jefferson, Thomas, 74–75
- Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 64
- Journal of Clinical Investigation*
 - papers rejected by, 65–66
- Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 91–92
- Journal of Consumer Research*, 33–34
- Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 153–154
- Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 31–32
- Journal of Forecasting*, 121–123, 153–156
- Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*
 - replication of research in, 39
- journal publications. *See also* published research; scientific journals
 - advocacy by reviewers and editors in, 63–64
 - “Author’s Formula” for increasing publication, 61–62
 - cheating in, 40
 - citation analysis and, 6–7
 - Compliance With Science Checklist* for papers in, 25–28
 - compliance with science in, 109–111
 - compliant with science section in, 158–159
 - cost/benefit implications of effect size, 153
 - criticism of, 31–32
 - delays in publication, 71
 - disclosure requirements in, 150–151
 - dismissal of reviews and failure to improve research in, 65–66
 - dissemination of findings through, 121–128
 - editor selection for, 155
 - failure of error identification in, 63
 - fake or predatory journals, 132–133
 - fraudulent reviews and bafflegab, 66–68
 - guidelines for improving, 147–160
 - identification of data fabrication by, 152–153

210 / Index

- journal publications. (cont.)
 - impact on decision-making of, 33–34
 - incentives for useful findings in, 148–149
 - invited papers by leading scientists, 153–154
 - as job requirement, 91–92
 - justified citations in, 150–151
 - lack of interest in usefulness of, 33–34
 - misplaced emphasis on statistical research in, 68–70
 - non-research topics in, 160
 - oath to uphold standards, 151–152
 - operational criteria for, 157–158
 - practices in, 32–33
 - readability in, 150–151
 - rejection of papers, appeal to editors concerning, 131
 - replication of research in, 35–36
 - responses to reviewers in, 131
 - retractions in, 6–7
 - reviews for improvement rather than rejection in, 154–156
 - reviews of scientific practice in, 61–71
 - snowballing in, 32–33
 - standards for, 121–123
 - structured abstracts in, 149
 - summaries of useful findings in, 160
 - suppression of evidence that challenges prior findings, 51, 64
 - unreliability of reviews in, 65
 - useful findings ignored in, 33–34
 - useless papers in, 62
- judgment
 - biases in, 49–50
- Kabat, G. C., 21, 38
- Kahneman, Daniel, 14, 48–50, 52–53, 56
- Karakatoa, eruption of 1883, 19
- Karpoff, J. M., 82
- Karr, A., 151
- Kealey, T., 77–78
- Keil, F. C., 67–68
- Kelvin (Lord), 4
- Kivetz, R., 56
- Koehler, J. J., 64
- Krause, S., 69
- Krugman, H. E., 14
- Kühberger, A., 52–53
- Kuhn, Thomas, 1
- Kupfersmid, J., 32–33, 100–109
- Labande, D. N., 153–154
- laboratory experiments, 18
- Lamar, Hedy, 165–166
- Latham, Gary, 50, 146
- law of demand
 - overlooked research on, 51–52
- leading scientists
 - scientific paper reviews by, 153–154
- legal policies
 - impact on science of, 86
- Lehrer, Jim, 162–163
- Lewis, Sinclair, 96
- liability
 - for statistical significance errors, 64–70
- Lieberman, N., 56
- Libman, M., 114–116
- A Life Against the Grain* (Simon), 96
- Lin, N., 65–66
- Linear-No-Threshold hypothesis on radiation and cancer, 52–53
- Lock, S., 65–66
- Locke, Edwin A., 50, 91–92, 146
- log of experiments
 - maintenance of, 124
- logic
 - faultiness in scientists of, 56
- logical conclusions
 - economics research and, xiv–xv
 - scientific method and, 22–23
- The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (Popper), 1
- Lott, John, 19–20, 116–117, 155–156
- Lysenko, T. D., 86–87

211 / Index

- machine learning models
 - limitations of, 54–56
 - violation of scientific method with, 20
- Mahoney, Michael J., 1–2, 57–58, 64, 66–68, 95–98
- Maier, N. R. F., 105
- mail surveys
 - non-response bias in, 63
- management science
 - checklist limitations in, 29–30
- Management Science*
 - objectivity of papers in, 57–58
- Manhattan Project, 73–74
- The Man Who Shocked the World* (Blass), 96
- manufacturing
 - private research in, 77–78
- marketing research
 - supply and demand theory and, xi
 - usefulness assessment of, 146–147
- Marshall, Alfred, xii, xiv
- “marshmallow study” of self-control, 92–95
- Martignon, L., 16
- “*Mathematical Game Theory as Applied to Physician Education*” (nonsense lecture), 66
- mathematics
 - use in scientific papers of, 123
- Matrixx v. Siracusano*, 64–70
- Mayo, Deborah, 22
- Mayr, E., 18
- McCloskey, D. N., 68–70
- McCord, J., 44–46
- McCullough, B. D., 35–36
- McMillan, N., 79–81
- media coverage of research, 167–169, 163
- Media Lab (MIT), 143–144
- medical knowledge
 - Multiple Reasonable Hypothesis Testing and, 14–15
 - skepticism concerning, 96, 107–108
 - structured abstracts in publications on, 149
- Meehl, P. E., 69, 130, 140–141
- Mendel, Gregor, 40
- mentorships for science students
 - research and, 98
- meta-analyses of experiments, 20–21
 - objectivity confirmation with, 109–111
- Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings*, 109–111
- Milgram, Stanley, 35–36, 86, 96, 109–116
- Miller, D. W., 56–57
- Mischel, W., 92–95
- Mitroff, I. I., 57–58
- Mixon, D., 114–116
- modal ratings
 - advocacy and absence of objectivity and, 59
- Mohammadipour, M., 35–36
- More Guns, Less Crime*, 155–156
- motivation in scientific research
 - intrinsic rewards and, 91–92, 144–146
- Motyl, M., 32–33
- Muller, Hermann, 52–53
- multi-authored research. *See also*
 - group-based research
 - government funding preferences for, 81–82
- multiple hypotheses
 - design of research based on, 111–113
 - objective design and, xiv
- Multiple Reasonable Hypotheses Testing (MHRT), 14–15
 - advocacy problem and, 57–59
 - objective testing, 157–158
- multiple regression analysis
 - simple alternatives to, 16–17
- Munafo, M. R., 32–33
- Murray, H. P., 91
- mysterious citations, 7
- Napping, scientific skills development and, 100–102
- National Science Foundation, 25–28
 - recommended improvements to grant processes, 79–81

212 / Index

- National Science Foundation (cont.)
 Science Development funding by, 76
National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (Australian Research Council and Universities Australia), 84–85
 natural experiments
 creativity in, 144–146
 effect size and direction in, 116–117
 on government-funded research, 77–78, 160–161
 research using, 18
 natural experiments in social sciences, 19–20
Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach (Dunning), 20
Natural Experiments of History (Diamond & Robinson), 19–20
Nature (journal)
 dismissal of guidelines in papers published in, 30
 online open access journal, 158–159
 replication of research and, 39–40
 Navasky, V., 3–5
 Nearing, Scott, 142
 Nelson, C. E., 65–66
New England Journal of Medicine, 14–15, 67
 new ideas
 evaluation of, 104–105
 Newton, Isaac, 14–15, 18–19, 40, 90–91
 non-experimental data
 limitations of, 21, 54
 usefulness of, 21
 non-response bias
 in mail surveys, 63
 Nosek, B. A., 32–33
 notes on research
 retention of, 111
 null hypothesis
 over-reliance in research on, 69
 Null Hypothesis Statistical Testing, 14–15
 Nuremberg Code of 1947, 83–84
 oaths on responsibility and disclosure, 124–125, 127, 151–152
 obedience to authority research, 86, 109–116
 replication of, 35–36
 objective research design
 in economics research, xii–xiii
 multiple hypotheses testing and, xiv
 operational criteria for, 157–158
 scientific method and, 14–15
 objectivity
 advocacy *vs.*, 59, 166
 government-funded research and lack of, 79–81
 meta-analysis as check on, 109–111
 operational criteria for, 157–158
 unnaturalness of, 44–46
 Occam, 16–17
 Occams Razor, 16–17
 Oh, I.-S., 139–141
 older scientific studies
 quality of, 109–111
 Open Science Collaboration (OSC), 39–40
 science in psychology research, 58–59
 operational criteria
 objective research and, 157–158
 scientific checklist development and, 25
 scientific practice and, 7–9
 Operations Research Society of America (ORSA)
 scientific practice guidelines by, 7–8
 oral-outcry two-sided auction, xi
 oral presentations of scientific findings
 guidelines for, 137–138
 Orwell, George, 4
 Ostrom, Elinor, 117
 Overton, T. S., 6–7, 63
Oxford English Dictionary (OEC)
 scientific method defined in, 11–12
 Pagell, R., 42–43
 paleontology
 experiments in, 19
 Patnaik, S., 37–38

213 / Index

- Paunonen, S. V., 91
- peer reviews
- academic dominance in, 61–62
 - advocacy in, 63–64
 - author-solicited reviewers, 124–127
 - confirmation bias in, 64
 - double-blind peer review, 70
 - elimination of, 153–154
 - failure to find errors in, 63
 - focus on errors in, 62
 - fraudulent reviews and bafflegab, 66–68
 - grant applications, 72–74
 - of grievance studies, 80–81
 - open peer review, 155–156
 - responses to, 131
 - unreliability of, 65
- Peirce, Charles Sanders, 12–13, 17–18, 111–113
- personality of scientists, 91
- Peters, D. P., 65
- p*-hacking, 41
- Phillips, A. G., 151–152
- Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (Newton), 14–15
- philosophy of science
- experimental data in, 22
- Piette, M. J., 153–154
- plagiarism in scientific research, 41, 133–138
- Plato, 10–11
- Platt, J. R., 14–15
- PLOS (Public Library of Science) online journal, 30, 111, 158–159
- PLoS ONE*
- identification of compliant with science papers on, 158–159
 - report registration, 151
 - research publication in, 131
 - reviews on, 156–157
- policy-making
- government-funded research and advocacy for, 79–81
 - political polls
 - reliability of, 119
- Popper, Karl, 1
- pop-science books
- limitations of, 133
- Porter, M., 29–30
- post-normal science, 4–5
- practical importance of effects
- data analysis based on, 106–119
- Practical Logic* (Beardsley), 22–23
- precautionary principle
- scientific opinion and, 4–5
- predictive validity
- in role-playing experiments, 115–116
 - shared experimental design and, 101–105
 - simplicity and, 16–17
- Prescott, Ed, 96
- pretesting of experiments
- design of research and, 109–114
- Principles of Forecasting: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners*, 153–154
- prior knowledge. *See also* cumulative scientific knowledge
- building on, 14
 - evidence of, in hiring process, 141
 - importance of, xii
 - inclusion in papers of, 123
 - problem identification based on, 109–111
 - prospect theory and, 52–53
- a priori analysis, 111
- private sector research funding
- Arctic expeditions, 82
 - government funding *vs.*, 75–78, 143–144
 - impact of government funding on, 77–78
 - success of, 165–166
- problem-solving
- brainstorming and, 102–103
 - current solutions as basis for, 100–103
 - existing knowledge about problem, 109–111

214 / Index

- problem-solving (cont.)
 - group meetings for, 104–105
 - impartiality in, 100–109
 - multiple hypotheses and, 111–113
 - problem selection checklist, 105–109
 - scientific method and problem selection, 12–13
 - scientists' research skills and, 100–102
- Problem-solving Discussions and Conferences* (Maier), 104–105
- The Production of Knowledge* (Starbuck), 31
- productivity of scientists
 - personality traits and, 91
- Pronovost, P. J., 7–9, 83–84
- Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (National Science Foundation), 25–28
- prospect theory
 - advocacy and, 48–49
 - avoiding rejection of hypotheses and, 52
 - biases in, 50
 - ex ante predictive validity testing, 52–53
 - faulty logic and, 56
 - judgment research and, 50
- proxy measures of research
 - subversion of science and, 5–7
- psychology research
 - advocacy *vs* objectivity in, 59
 - cheating awareness in, 41–42
 - confirmation bias in, 64
 - impact of replication on, 39–40
 - scientific method in, 58–59
- publicity about research
 - feedback from, 101–105
- public works projects
 - inconsistent results in replication research on, 36–37
- published research. *See also* journal publications
 - acknowledgment of funders in, 127–132
 - advocacy by reviewers and editors in, 63–64
 - “Author’s Formula” for, 61–62
 - author-solicited peer reviewers for, 126–127
 - authors’ previous contributions, importance of, 70, 140
 - in books, 133
 - cheating in, 40
 - checklist for writing of, 121–128
 - citation analysis and, 6–7
 - citation verification in, 125–126
 - Compliance With Science Checklist* for, 25–28, 121–128
 - compliance with science in, 109–111
 - content checklist, 121–128
 - cost–benefit implications of effect size, 153
 - credibility and usefulness of findings in, 121–123
 - criticism of, 31–32
 - data and methods validity and replication, 124–125
 - delays in publication, 71
 - disclosure requirements for, 150–151
 - dismissal of reviews and failure to improve research, 65–66
 - dissemination of findings through, 121–128
 - editor selection for, 155
 - explanation of findings, 121–123
 - failure of error identification in, 63
 - fraudulent reviews and bafflegab, 66–68
 - guidelines for improving, 147–160
 - identification of data fabrication in, 152–153
 - impact on decision-making of, 33–34
 - incentives for useful findings in, 148–149
 - invited papers by leading scientists, 153–154
 - as job requirement, 91–92
 - journal reviews of scientific practice, 61–71
 - justified citations in, 150–151
 - misplaced emphasis on statistical research in, 68–70
 - oath on responsibility and disclosure, 127

215 / Index

- oath to uphold standards, 151–152
- operational criteria for, 157–158
- in *PLoS One*, 131
- practices in, 32–33
- prior hypotheses in, 123
- publishing guidelines for, 128
- readability of, 150–151
- relevance of evidence to findings, 125–126
- in ResearchGate, 130–133
- responses to reviewers of, 131
- retractions in, 6–7
- reviews for improvement rather than rejection in, 154–156
- skepticism concerning, 95–98
- snowballing in, 32–33
- standards for, 121–123
- structured abstracts for, 149
- summaries of useful findings in, 160
- suppression of evidence that challenges findings, 51, 64
- unreliability of reviews in, 65
- useful findings ignored in, 33–34
- useless papers in, 62
- quality assessment
 - scientific practices, 31–43
- quantitative models
 - personnel selection using, 130
- quasi-controlled experiments, 18
 - validity testing of, 37–38
- questionnaires
 - checklist for production of, 118–119
- Radio Corporation of America (RCA), 90–91
- Radner, Roy, xii
- Rasmussen, D., 29–30
- ratings for scientific research
 - Compliance With Science Checklist* and, 25–28
- Rawson, E., 67–68
- readability of papers
 - decline in, 67
 - publishers' requirement for, 150–151
- red and processed meat, health
 - outcomes of
 - suppression of evidence questioning outcomes, 51, 64
- Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence*, 7–8
- registration of hypotheses, 111
- registration of research, 151
- regulation of research
 - government role in, 83–87, 160–161
 - negative impact of, 85–86, 124–125, 143–144
- rejection of research
 - avoidance of conditions allowing for, 52
 - improvement as alternative to, 154–156
- reliability of data, xiii
 - establishment of, 119
 - scientific method and, 15–16
- replication
 - assessment in papers of, 124–125
 - cooperation on, 135
 - criteria for successful replication, 37
 - delusion/fallacy concerning statistics, 39–40
 - failure of disclosure and undermining of, 38–40
 - favorable conditions for, 37–38
 - importance of, 108
 - incentives for journal articles on, 148–149
 - reversal of influential prior findings with, 36–37
 - in scientific method, 14
 - of scientific research, 35–36
 - validity of findings established with, 34–35
- ResearchGate, 130–133
- Research Grants Office (U.S.), 72–74
- research practice
 - inefficiencies in, 42–43
 - proxy measurements of, 5–7
 - survey of, 32–33
- retracted research
 - cheating and, 40
 - citations for, 6–7

216 / Index

- Retraction Watch website, 133–138
- reversals of medical treatment
 - recommendations
 - research on, 14–15
- reviews
 - fraudulent reviews, 66–68
 - identification of compliant with
 - science papers, 158–159
 - as improvement rather than rejection
 - of papers, 154–156
 - by leading scientists, 153–154
 - of scientific practice, 61–71
 - structuring checklist for, 156–157
 - unreliability of, 65
- revisions to papers
 - advocacy-based revisions, pressure for, 63–64
 - importance during writing phase of, 123
- rewards of research
 - impact on results of, 91–92
- Ridd, Peter, 143
- Ridley, M., 144–146
- “Right-turn-on-red” rule
 - statistical misperceptions on safety of, 69–70
- Ring, K., 114–116
- Robber’s Cave field experiment, 80–81
- Robinson, J. A., 19–20
- role-playing experiments
 - design of research and, 114–116
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 75–78
- Royal Society, 17–18
- Rucker, D. D., 56
- “Rules of Reasoning in Philosophy”
 - (Newton), 14–15
- Rushton, J. P., 91
- Sacks, J., 79–81
- safety research
 - government regulations in, 83
- Schattke, K., 91–92
- A Scheme of Heaven: Astrology and the Birth of Science*, 54–56
- Schmidt, F. L., 34–35, 53–54, 69, 109–111, 139–141
- Schneider, C. E., 85–86
- Scholarly Commons
 - dissemination of research using, 128, 132–133
- Schrag, Z. M., 85–86
- Schultz, Randall, 146–147
- Schwartz, A. J., 109–111
- Science Citation Index (SCI), 6–7
- Science* journal
 - unreliability of reviews in, 65
- scientific journals. *See also* journal
 - publications; published research
 - checklist for publishing in, 128
 - compliant with science section in, 158–159
 - cost–benefit implications of effect size, 153
 - disclosure requirements in, 150–151
 - editor selection for, 155
 - fake or predatory journals, 132–133
 - guidelines for improving, 147–160
 - identification of data fabrication by, 152–153
 - impact on decision-making of, 33–34
 - incentives for useful findings at, 148–149
 - invited papers by leading scientists, 153–154
 - justified citations in, 150–151
 - non-research topics in, 160
 - oath to uphold standards, 151–152
 - operational criteria for, 157–158
 - readability in, 150–151
 - rejection of papers, appeal to editors
 - concerning, 131
 - replicability of research and, 35–36
 - responses to reviewers in, 131
 - reviews for improvement rather than
 - rejection in, 154–156
 - structured abstracts in, 149
 - summaries of useful research in, 160
 - useful findings ignored in, 62
- scientific method
 - advocacy and, 164–169
 - aspirational definition of, 10–12

217 / Index

- compliance criteria for, 12–23
- elements of, 10–11
- experimental evidence and, 17–22
- historical legacy of, 1–2
- logical conclusions in, 22–23
- objective design in, 14–15
- objective of, 5
- prior knowledge building and, 14
- problem selection in, 12–13
- psychology research, 58–59
- replicability in, 14, 37–38
- research practices and, 32–33
- scientific opinion *vs.*, 3–5
- search for evidence based on, 109–111
- scientific opinion
 - scientific method *vs.*, 3–5
- scientific papers
 - accessibility of, 132–135
 - acknowledgment of funders in, 127–132
 - appeal of rejection of, 131
 - author-solicited peer reviewers for, 126–127
 - checklist for publishing, 128
 - checklist for writing of, 121–128
 - citation verification in, 125–126
 - classroom dissemination of, 132–135
 - content checklist, 121–128
 - credibility and usefulness of findings in, 121–123
 - data and methods validity and replication, 124–125
 - dissemination of findings through, 121–128
 - explanation of findings, 121–123
 - identification of compliant with science papers, 158–159
 - invited papers by leading scientists, 153–154
 - oath on responsibility and disclosure, 127
 - prior hypotheses in, 123
 - relevance of evidence to findings, 125–126
 - responses to reviewers in, 131
 - reviews for improvement rather than rejection of, 154–156
 - scientific practice
 - confirmation bias and, 47–48
 - government involvement in, 72–87, 160–161
 - historical legacy of, 1–2
 - journal review of, 61–71
 - operational guidelines for, 7–9
 - quality assessment of, 31–43
 - regulation of, 83–87
 - subversion of science and, 5–7
 - Scientific Reports*, 158–159
 - scientific research
 - cheating in, 40
 - early interest of scientists in, 90–91
 - extension of, 108
 - government regulation of, 83–87, 160–161
 - growth in demand for researchers, 76
 - media coverage of, 163
 - replication of, 108
 - scientists' skills and, 88
 - skepticism in, 95–98
 - statistical research harm in, 68–70
 - team-based research, impact on results of, 81–82
 - universities as stakeholders in, 139–147
 - Scientist as Subject* (Mahoney), 1–2
 - scientists as stakeholders, 167–169
 - scientists' research skills
 - age and productivity of scientists, 97–98
 - brainstorming, 102–103
 - early desire to do research, 90–91
 - general mental ability, 88–89, 139–141
 - heredity and, 89–90
 - importance of, 88
 - independent work and, 102
 - motivation of intrinsic rewards and, 91–92, 144–146
 - personality traits and, 91
 - prior useful knowledge and, 141
 - problem identification, 100–102
 - relevant knowledge and, 98–99

218 / Index

- scientists' research skills (cont.)
 - self-control, 92–95
 - skepticism, 95–98
 - statistics on PhD science candidates, 97–98
- The Scientist as a Rebel* (Dyson), 96
- SCIgen hoax, 42
- Scopus website, 5–7
- second-solution technique, 105
- Secret Science Reform Act of 2014 (H.R. 4012), 83
- Seer Sucker Theory, 4–5
- self-assessment
 - checklist for self-control and, 94–95, 140
 - development of, 151–152
- self-censorship
 - government involvement in research and, 86–87
- self-control
 - scientists' need for, 92–95
 - self-assessment checklist, 94–95, 140
- self-funded research, 165–166
- Shadish, W. R., 20
- The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses*, 142
- Shaffer, J. A., 139–141
- Shepherd, G. B., 64
- Silvia, P. J., 151–152
- Simon, Julian, 54, 96
- Simonson, J., 56
- Simple Heuristics That Make Us Smart* (Gigerenzer), 133
- simple methods
 - validity of, 16–17
- simplicity of research design, xiii–xiv
 - data analysis and, 106–119
- simulations
 - forecasting research and, 101–105
- skepticism
 - lack of experimental evidence as grounds for, 107–108
 - as research skill, 95–98
 - scientific knowledge and importance of, 81–82
- Skunk Works (Lockheed Corporation), 145
- Smith, Adam, 56, 74–75
- Smith, J., 65–66
- Smith, Lamar, 83
- Smith, Vernon, 17–22, 50, 117
- Smyth, J. D., 118–119
- Snow, John, 118–119
- snowballing
 - in research practices, 32–33
- social loafing
 - group-based research and, 102
- Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)*, 6–7, 109–111
- social science research
 - invited papers, 153–154
 - lack of interest in usefulness of, 33–34
- Society for Medical Decision Making, 24–25
 - scientific checklist development and, 24–25
- Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 144
- Socrates, 10–11
- solution development
 - evaluation avoidance and, 105
 - independent work on, 103
- Soyer, E., 155
- speech restriction
 - government involvement in research and, 86–87
- Spies, J. R., 32–33
- sports
 - statistical significance in, 68
- The Sports Gene* (Epstein), 88
- SQUIRE practice guidelines, 7–8
- stakeholders in science, 167–169
 - universities, 139–147
- standards for journals, 121–123
 - oaths to uphold, 151–152
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 148–149
- statistical models
 - judgments *vs.*, 140–141
 - liability for errors in, 64–70

219 / Index

- machine learning and, 55
- misperceptions on importance of, 39–40, 68–70
- replication fallacy/delusion and, 39–40
- status quo bias
 - prospect theory and, 56
- Staw, B. M., 36
- stomach ulcers
 - skepticism concerning research on, 107–108
- The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Kuhn), 1
- Styer, P., 79–81
- Sue, Kimberly, 85
- supervision
 - suppression of creativity and, 144–146
- supply and demand (S&D) theory
 - markets and, xi
- Sveikauskas, L., 77–78
- Syntetos, A. A., 35–36
- Szilard, Leo, 73–74
- Tangney, J. P., 92–95
- Tappeiner, G., 42–43
- television, invention of, 90–91
- tenured faculty
 - cheating awareness in, 41
 - history of, 142
- Tetlock, P. E., 4–5
- Thinking, Fast and Slow* (Kahneman), 52–53
- Thursby, J. G., 39
- “too-many-choices” consumer research
 - replication reversal of results in, 36
- tragedy of the commons research, 117
- Trotter, Wilfred, 105
- Tuskegee syphilis study, 83–84
- Tversky, A., 48–50, 52–53, 56
- “2-4-6” problem
 - confirmation bias and, 47–48
- United Kingdom
 - free speech in, 142
 - research ethics in, 84–85
- universities. *See also* private sector research
 - challenges to assumptions about education at, 44–46
 - creativity at, 144–146
 - dissemination of findings, 128, 132–135, 146–147
 - diversity of ideas at, 144
 - freedom to think and speak at, 142–144
 - government-funded research, 72–87
 - growth of government involvement in, 72–74
 - hiring criteria for scientists at, 139–142
 - non-monetary motivations for, 76
 - ombudsman at, 147
 - postwar government funding involvement in, 61, 75–78
 - as stakeholders in scientific research, 139–147, 167–169
 - statistics on PhD science candidates, 97–98
- University of Chicago
 - free speech at, 142–143
- University of Pennsylvania, 128, 132–133
- unreliability of reviews
 - published research and, 65
- useful findings in research
 - checklist for, 106–120
 - cost–benefit implications of effect size, 153
 - explanation of, 121–123
 - focus on errors as barrier to identifying, 62
 - lack of interest in, among scientific journal editors, 33–34
 - promotion of articles containing, 148–149
 - published summaries of, 160
 - in scientific papers, 121–123
 - useful knowledge dissemination, 146–147

USGS Science Strategy to Support U.S.
*Fish and Wildlife Service Polar Bear
 Listing Decision*, 48–50

validity of data, xiii

- assessment in papers of, 124–125
- collection of valid data, 117–119
- construct validity, 37
- ex ante predictive validity, 52–53
- multiple validations of, 106–119
- replication as confirmation of, 34–35
- scientific method and, 15–16
- simple methods for, 16–17

Vetter, D. E., 34–35

Vitouch, O., 69

Wallston, K., 114–116

Wang, D., 81–82

war games research

- role-playing in, 115–116

warnings to subjects

- design of research and, 114

Wason, P. C., 47–48

Weisberg, D. S., 67–68

Western Approaches Tactical Unit
 (WATU) experiment, 115–116

White, B. L., 10–11

Wilcox, J., 148–149

Wiley publishing company, 151

Winston, C., 85–86

Wonderly, D. M., 32–33

Woozle effect, 50–51

writing guidelines for scientific research

- avoiding complexity, 66–68
- avoiding distractions,
 127–128
- checklist for, 122–129
- decline in clarity, 66–68
- explanation of findings,
 121–123
- guidelines for clarity, 121–123
- list of recurring faults in scientific
 prose, 67
- prior hypotheses descriptions and
 changes, 123
- title guidelines, 132–135

Wu, L., 81–82

Young, N. S., 64

Young, S. S., 151

Ziliak, S. T., 68–70