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Writing

- The only way to become a good writer is to practice, practice, practice.
- **Write every day for at least 30 minutes!**
- If possible, have an excellent writer give you feedback on your writing.
- Some people are better writers than others, but writing is a skill almost everyone can learn.

Tell a good story.
- Should be interesting.
- Should be coherent.
- Should have a plot.

Writing

- Write with your *grandmother* in mind.
- Keep it clear (avoid synonyms).
- Keep it accurate.
- Keep it interesting.
- Keep it simple.
- Keep it short — “omit needless words”
- Keep it well organized
- Avoid technical jargon.

Bem (2001); Strunk & White (1979)
Introduction

Methods &
Results

Discussion

Writing

Paper shaped like an hour glass.

Top part is the Introduction. It should begin broadly, and become more narrow. It ends with a statement of the hypothesis.

Narrowest part is the Methods and Results.

Bottom part is the Discussion. It should mirror the Introduction. Begin with a restatement of the hypothesis, then become broader and broader, ending with a “take home” message.

How Can I Conduct Studies That Turn Out?

You cannot afford to conduct studies not turn out.

Do smaller pilot studies first to see if the results are in the predicted direction.

Make sure the procedures are standardized to reduce error variance.

Use strong manipulations.

Use multiple dependent variables.

Include moderators in case effects are weak.

Moderator & Mediator (Intervening) Variables

Moderators: Influence the strength and/or direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Moderators interact with the independent variable to influence the dependent variable.

Moderating effects of a third variable (Z) on the relation between the stimulus (X) and the response (Y)

\[ Z \]

\[ X \]

\[ Y \]
Moderator & Mediator (Intervening) Variables

- **Moderators**: Influence the strength and/or direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Moderators interact with the independent variable to influence the dependent variable.
- **Mediators (intervening variables)**: The generative mechanism through which the independent variable influences the dependent variable. Independent variables produce changes in mediators which, in turn, produce changes in dependent variables.

Mediating effects of the third variable ($Z$) on the relation between the stimulus ($X$) and the response ($Y$)

$$X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y$$

How Can I Conduct So Many Studies?

- Approach experts in the field and ask them if they want to be an author on your paper.
- It increases the likelihood that your paper will get published.
  - Their reputation will help!
  - Their expertise will help!
- You build connections with people that will evaluate your work.
- They may invite YOU to work on a line of research with them.

How Can I Conduct So Many Studies?

- Broaden your thinking about possible publications.
  - Write a paper that requires no data (e.g., a theoretical piece).
  - Write a paper that uses secondary data (e.g., meta-analysis).
  - Conduct studies that do not require participants to come to a lab
    - Online studies
    - Field studies

Stanley Milgram's Lost Letter Paradigm

Milgram dropped stamped envelopes around a college campus and counted how many letters were mailed. People were more likely to mail letters addressed to socially desirable groups (e.g., medical research organizations) than to socially undesirable groups (e.g., communist organizations).

Lost E-Mail Study

- Participants were 512 (194 men, 318 women) White college students.
- Two weeks prior to the study, participants completed an 11-item prejudice scale in class.
  - If there are too many _____ (African-, Arab-, Asian-, European-, and Hispanic-Americans), in America, our country will be less safe.
  - I can hardly imagine myself voting for a(n) _____ who is running for an important political office.
Lost E-Mail Study

- Participants received a "lost" e-mail for ...
  - Males: Mohammed Hameed / Peter Brice
  - Females: Fatima Hameed / Julianna Brice
- The e-mail stated that the student either won (positive feedback) or did not win (negative feedback) a prestigious 4-year scholarship to any state-funded university (worth tens of thousands of dollars). A response was required within 48 hours.
- The dependent variable was whether they returned the “lost” e-mail to the sender.

Prejudiced Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Arab Target</th>
<th>European Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Prejudiced Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Arab Target</th>
<th>European Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movie Field Study

- Participants were 162 adult movie-goers.
- They saw either a violent movie (rated 17+) or a nonviolent movie.
Participants were 162 adult movie-goers. They saw either a violent movie (rated 17+) or a nonviolent movie. Actress with a wrapped ankle dropped her crutches before or after the movie. A researcher timed how long it took a movie-goer to pick up the crutches.

How Can I Publish My Papers in Top Tier Journals?

- Make sure your research is based on theory. Editors, reviewers, and readers want to know why you got the observed effects. What is the underlying mechanism?
- It helps to have paradoxical findings.
- It helps if the research has applied significance.

Titles

- Often readers just scan a table of contents and decide whether the title justifies their turning to the article.
- A title should summarize the main idea of the paper simply and, if possible, with style.
- It should be a concise statement of the main topic and should identify the variables under investigation and the relationship between them.

- It should be self-explanatory.
- Recommended length is 10-12 words.
- A good title easily compresses to the short title, called the running head (50 characters, including spaces).
- Avoid words that serve no useful purpose (e.g., “A Study of…”)
- The title should include important keywords (for computer databases).
Bushman & Wells (2001) Study

- Participants ($N = 280$) reviewed 20 fictional studies on similarity and attraction (small positive effect overall, $d = 0.2$).
- Participants received either brief training in meta-analytic techniques or no training.
- Salience of study titles was manipulated.

Salient Titles

For Positive Results
- “Birds of a Feather Flock Together”
- “From the Same Mold”
- “Peas in a Pod”

For Negative Results
- “Opposites Attract”
- “Different as Night and Day”
- “Nothing in Common”

Non-Salient Titles

- “Research Examines Similarity as Source of Liking”
- “Social Psychologists Study Matchmaking”
- “Research Asks Who Likes Whom”

Narrative review group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Salience</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Estimated Effect Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meta-analytic review group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Salience</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Estimated Effect Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Effect Magnitude

- Studies with positive results had salient titles
- Studies with negative results had salient titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Review Group</th>
<th>Estimated Effect Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Analytic</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Titles from My Own Research

- Forbidden fruit versus tainted fruit: Effects of warning labels on attraction to television violence.
- Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence?
- Trait aggressiveness and hockey penalties: Predicting hot tempers on the ice.
- Mirror, mirror on the wall, who’s the thinnest one of all? Effects of self-awareness on consumption of fatty, reduced-fat, and fat-free products.
- If the television program bleeds, memory for the advertisement fades.
- Does venting anger feed or extinguish the flame? Catharsis, rumination, distraction, anger, and aggressive responding.
- You’ve got mail: Using e-mail to examine the effect of prejudiced attitudes on discrimination against Arabs.
- When God sanctions killing; Effect of scriptural violence on aggression.
Good Titles
- Aggress to impress: Hostility as an evolved context-dependent strategy.
- Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity.
- Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations.
- Looking into the past: Cultural differences in perception and representation of past information.
- Not so black and white: Memory for ambiguous group members.
- You don't have to believe everything you read: Background knowledge permits fast and efficient validation of information.

Bad Titles
- Implicit misattribution as a mechanism underlying evaluative conditioning.
- A mechanistic explanation of popularity: Genes, rule breaking, and evocative gene–environment correlations.
- Motivated response styles: The role of cultural values, regulatory focus, and self-consciousness in socially desirable responding.
- Dispositional optimism and engagement: The moderating influence of goal prioritization.
- When dispositional and role power fit: Implications for self-expression and self–other congruence.
- Contrast effects in spontaneous evaluations: A psychophysical account.

Abstracts
- If the title is interesting, people might read your abstract.
- The abstract is a comprehensive summary of the entire contents of the article.
- Most important paragraph in the article!
  - If the abstract is interesting, people might read your article.
  - The abstract becomes part of a computer database.

Abstracts
- A good abstract is:
  - Accurate
  - Self-contained. No acronyms! It should include such information as:
    - The problem under investigation
    - Participant information
    - Method
    - Findings
    - Conclusions, implication, applications
  - Concise and specific. 100-150 words (depends on journal). Make each sentence maximally informative, especially the lead sentence. The abstract is not indented (waste 5 spaces).
  - Use digits for all numbers (e.g., 13 instead of thirteen).
  - Abbreviate (e.g., vs. for versus)
  - Use active voice. “Participants read …” vs. “Participants were asked to read…”
Abstracts

Coherent and readable
- Write in clear and vigorous prose.
- Use verbs.
- Use active rather than passive voice.
- Use present tense to describe results and conclusions

Bem (2003); Sternberg (2000)

Introduction

Introduction has three parts.
- First part grabs the reader’s attention and provides a theoretical basis for the research.
- Second part provides a focused review of past research, identifying a gap in the literature.
- Third part explains how the present study will fill the gap in the literature. It provides an overview of the study and the hypothesis to be tested.

Kendall, Silk, & Chu (2000)

Part 1: Grab Readers Attention and Provide Theoretical Basis

- If your title and abstract are interesting, people might read the first paragraph of your article (2nd most important paragraph).
- Begin by talking about people, not researchers.
- Write in English prose, not psychological jargon.
- Do not plunge unprepared readers into the middle of your problem or theory.
- Use examples to illustrate abstract ideas.

Bem (2003)

Part 1: Grab Readers Attention and Provide Theoretical Basis

- Good beginnings:
- Quotation
- Interesting example
- Rhetorical question
- Everyday experience
- Analogy or metaphor
- Striking statistic or fact

Kendall, Silk, & Chu (2000)
Good Beginnings

- The ability to become aware of one’s own actions and their consequences is a uniquely human trait.
- Two guys walk into a bar. The first, professional basketball player Charles Barkley, orders a drink. The second, a local man named Jorge Lugo, tosses some water at Barkley without provocation. Barkley can respond in one of two ways: Ignore the insult or retaliate. Ignoring the insult is the safe and seemingly rational choice; after all, water dries quickly, and Barkley will probably never see Lugo again. Retaliating is more knuckleheaded and has high costs: Not only can it lead to a lawsuit or prison, but Lugo might have a weapon or some friends ready to retaliate. Despite the high potential costs, Barkley spends little time making his decision: He swiftly hurls Lugo through a plate-glass window.

Good Beginnings

- The attacks on the World Trade towers, the bombings in Madrid and London, and similar terrorist acts have prompted a perplexed world to ask why anyone would sacrifice themselves on behalf of a group.
- Many aspects of life involve avoiding death either physically or psychologically.
- The human family now exists under conditions of a “global village.” We live in a single, constructed space resonant with tribal drums. —Marshall McLuhan, The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man
- It is the part of a wise man to keep himself today for tomorrow, and not venture all his eggs in one basket. —Sancho Panza in Miguel de Cervantes, Don Quixote

Good Beginnings

- On April 1, 2001, an American spy plane collided with a Chinese fighter jet sent to intercept it over the South China Sea. The Chinese pilot died in the crash, whereas the American crew landed safely. After the incident, the Chinese government demanded an apology from the U.S. government. By focusing on what happened right before the collision, the U.S. government insisted that the Chinese pilot was responsible and refused to apologize. In contrast, the Chinese government and people considered other events that had happened a long time ago between China and the United States (such as the 1999 U.S.-led NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade) and concluded that this event was just another act of American bullying and an apology was due (Aberman, 2001; see also Gries & Peng, 2002).

Good Beginnings

- The hope of many people was that the civil rights movement and the changes in norms regarding the acceptability of prejudice would result in the elimination of prejudice from people's hearts, minds, and behavior.
- “Business people are rich and smart, but they are arrogant and calculating.” “Women are warm and caring, but they can't perform in demanding jobs.” These are but a few illustrations of views that are commonly held about various groups.
- In a survey of over 21,000 people across 38 countries, Americans ranked themselves first in their understanding of nutritional information, yet only 38% of respondents in the United States had heard of the glycemic index (compared with 80% in Korea).

Bad Beginnings

- Social psychological theory on attitude formation has historically received comparatively little attention, compared with other aspects of attitude theory such as structure, function, and change (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).
- A large scholarly literature has accumulated suggesting perfectionism is linked to various forms of psychopathology, including suicide behaviors (Hewitt, Flett, Sherry, & Caetlan, 2006), depression (Dunkley, Zuroff, & Blankstein, 2003), and interpersonal problems (Sherry, Hewitt, Flett, Lee-Baggley, & Hall, 2007).
- Over the past two decades, social power has emerged as a major topic of inquiry among social and personality psychologists (Fiske & Deaux, 1996; Kelner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2000; Kelner, Van Klee, Chen, & Kraus, 2008; Lee-Chai & Bargh, 2001).

Bad Beginnings

- In contrast to theories of ability based on, for example, genetic differences between groups (see Benbow & Stanley, 1980), stereotype threat research has shown that the situation—namely, performing in a domain that can confirm or disconfirm a negative stereotype about one’s group—contributes to group differences on tasks as diverse as intelligence tests (e.g., Steele & Aronson, 1995), memory tests (e.g., Levy, 1996), mental rotation tasks (e.g., Wraga, Duncan, Jacobs, Helt, & Church, 2006), golf putting (e.g., Belock, Jellison, Rydell, McConnell, & Carr, 2006), and math tests (e.g., Belock, Rydell, & McConnell, 2007; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999).
Part 2: Review Research and Identify Gap in Literature

- "Discuss the literature but do not include an exhaustive historical review.... [C]ite and reference only works pertinent to the specific issue and not works of only tangential or general significance. If you summarize earlier works, avoid nonessential details; instead, emphasize pertinent findings, relevant methodological issues, and major conclusions. Refer the reader to general surveys or reviews of the topic if they are available." (APA, 2001, p. 16)

- There are two possible ways to cite articles:
  - "MAO activity in some individuals with schizophrenia is actually higher than normal (Tse & Tung, 1949)."
  - "Tse and Tung (1949) report that MAO activity in some individuals with schizophrenia is actually higher than normal."

- Use the first way. Don’t make researchers the subjects of your sentences.

Part 3: Explain How Study Will Fill the Gap in the Literature

- End the introduction with a brief overview of your own study and how it will fill the gap in the literature. This provides a smooth transition into the method section.

- Overview should include:
  - The potential implications of the study
  - The general nature of the study
  - The specific hypotheses

Method

- As an Editor or Reviewer, I first read the Method section. If the methods are flawed, I don’t waste my time reading the rest of the manuscript.
- The Method section should tell the reader what you did and how you did it.
- It should include enough detail to allow readers to replicate the study.
Method

- Readers should have a feel for what it was like to be a participant in the study.
- A good design should rule out alternative explanations for findings.
- Like a good map, the Method section should show a clear connection between theory and findings.
- Use plain English, not technical jargon.

Subsections of Method Section

- Participants
- Design (optional)
- Apparatus / Materials (optional)
- Procedure

Participants

- In cover letter must say that they were treated in accordance with APA ethical principles
- Use the term “participants” rather than “subjects”
- Report the number of participants
- Report if any participants were discarded, and why.

Group | Stayed in | Dropped out
--- | --- | ---
1 | 60 | 4
2 | 62 | 2
3 | 61 | 3
4 | 64 | 0

Can do a Fisher’s exact test to see if the drop out rate differed across groups.

Participants

Demographics
- Sex
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Sexual orientation
- Children
  - Must have parental consent
  - Report % of parents consenting

Participants

Motivation
- Course requirement?
- Extra credit?
- Pay?
- No pay - just volunteered?
Subsections of Method Section

- Participants
- Design (optional)

Design (optional)

- Often useful for a factorial design
  - Use standard notation: $A (a_1, a_2) \times B (b_1, b_2) \times C (c_1, c_2)$
  - Specify between- and within-subjects factors
    - Use “between-subjects” rather than “between-participants”

Apparatus / Materials (optional)

- Use *Apparatus / Materials* section *If* it makes prose smoother
- Described complicated equipment
- Scales (e.g., personality traits)
  - Reliability
  - Validity
  - If mailed, give return rate

Procedure

- Give the reader a feel for what it was like to be a participant in the study.
- Lead the reader by the hand through the procedure from the beginning to the end.
- Include (or paraphrase) instructions to participants. Use exact instructions for experimental manipulations.
Procedure

- Describe randomization, counterbalancing, and other control features of the design.
- Name all groups, variables, and operations
  - Avoid empty labels (e.g., Group 1)
  - Avoid acronyms and abbreviations
  - Use operational labels (rather than conceptual labels)

Procedure

- Discuss any ethical procedures
  - Debriefing
  - Confusion
  - Suspicion
- Appendices can include new scales or measures, photos of stimuli, etc.

Results

As an Editor and Reviewer, if the Methods are good I read the Results section next. (I skip the Introduction and Discussion.)
- The Results should tell a story.
- Summarize the data collected and the statistical procedures used to analyze data.
- Report the data in sufficient detail to justify the conclusions.
- Show that you had enough power to test your hypotheses (especially for $ns$ results).

Results

- Mention all relevant results, including those that contradict your hypotheses.
- Write the results in English prose. Don’t just throw numbers and statistics at readers.
- Don’t assume the results are obvious to readers; explain the results to them.
- It is sometimes useful to divide the Results section into two sections: (1) Preliminary Results, and (2) Primary Results

Preliminary Results

- Gender differences - if none, combine the data for men and women.
- Manipulation checks
- Reliability of raters/coders
- Data transformations
- Outliers
Primary Results

- Describe data analysis procedure (e.g., ANOVA). If the procedure is likely to be unfamiliar to readers, describe it.
- Present the forest first (i.e., central findings), then the trees (i.e., peripheral findings).
- Remind readers of the conceptual hypothesis and operational definitions.
- Tell readers if the data support the hypothesis.

Bem (2003)

Primary Results

- First state results in plain English, then back up your words with statistics.
- Report an effect size estimate for each statistical test.
  - Use standardized mean difference for comparisons between two groups
  - Use correlation coefficient for two continuous variables
  - Use odds ratio for two dichotomous variables
  - Use $\chi^2$ for interactions or multiple degree of freedom tests.

Bem (2003)

Primary Results

- Elaborate or qualify result if necessary.
- Don't report a mean without a standard deviation (or standard error). If the group sample sizes are not equal, state the sample size for each group.
  - Needed for meta-analytic reviews.
  - Use descriptive indices or statistics that convey the behavior of your participants as vividly as possible.

Bem (2003)

Primary Results

- Lower order effects (e.g., main effects) are usually qualified by higher order effects (e.g., interactions).
  - Focus on the higher order effects.
  - Use transitions to move from forest to trees.
  - Use qualitative results to support your results (e.g., debriefing comments, thought listing responses).

Bem (2003)

Tables and Figures

- Results sections are more readable if you can remove numbers from the text; put them in tables and figures instead.
- Use tables for main effects.
- Use figures for interactions.
  - Use a bar graph (histogram) if the independent variable is categorical. Include standard error bars.
  - Use a line graph if the independent variable is continuous.

Salovey (2000)
Tables and Figures

- It is not sufficient to note parenthetically, at the end of a sentence "(see Table 1)"
- Within the text, lead the reader by the hand through the table or figure.
- Avoid redundancy. Do not repeat numbers in the text and in a table.
- Table and Figure legends should contain enough information for readers to interpret them.

**Figure 2.** Effect of identifying with violent and nonviolent characters in video games on aggression. Aggression was defined as the level of noise participants set for their ostensible partner on the first trial of the competitive reaction time task (before they had heard any noise themselves). Noise levels ranged from level 1 (60 dB) to level 10 (105 dB), in 5 dB increments. Participants were told that levels 8-10 could cause permanent hearing damage. Note that participants who strongly identified with violent video game characters exceeded level 8 noise, even though it could have permanently damaged their partner’s ears. A nonaggressive no noise option was also given (level 0), although no boy chose level 0.

Discussion

“Imagine that you are acting as a lawyer before an enormous panel of judges: other researchers, journal editors and reviewers, critics present and future. Earlier in your case you have set the stage and mustered evidence. Your concluding statement must now pull the pieces together, connect your claims with the data, defend against counterarguments and alternative interpretations, and convince the audience of the validity and value of your case” (Calfee, 2000, p. 134)
Discussion

The Discussion section can be a separate section, or it can be included with the Results section in brief research reports.

The Discussion is the bottom part of hourglass that mirrors the Introduction. Move from the specifics of your study to broader, more general issues.

Begin by telling readers what you learned from the study. Was the hypothesis supported?

Three guiding questions:

- What have I contributed here?
- How has my study helped resolve the original problem?
- What conclusions and theoretical implications can I draw from my study?

Begin with the central findings and then discuss the peripheral ones.

Don’t just restate the results.

Compare your results with those obtained by other researchers.

The Discussion section is where researchers often argue for the generalizability of their results.

- Should the results generalize to other people (besides college students)?
- Should the results generalize outside the lab setting?

What are the theoretical and practical implications of the results?

Speculate, but not too much.

Describe the limitations of your study (but don’t dwell on every flaw). It is better if you point out the flaws than if reviewers do.

Even if the data are clear and convincing to you, critics will usually search for (and often find) flaws in methodology and alternative interpretations of the results.

“There is a -.73 correlation between the clarity of an investigator’s results and the length of his or her discussion section. Do not contribute to this shameful statistic” (Bem, 2000).

Discuss future research ideas, but do not end the manuscript this way.

Conclude with a take-home message.

End with a bang, not a whimper.
Good Endings

The current set of studies supports the notion that aggression can serve multiple evolutionary functions. Important among these is its use as a means to compete for status. Although direct aggression has obvious costs, it can provide important reputational benefits, sometimes leading men to aggress to impress. For instance, on the night when an insult led Charles Barkley to hurl a man through a plate-glass window, onlookers were quick to notice his actions. Barkley’s reputation only grew as witnesses gushed to reporters in admiration of his feat (“Barkley arrested after bar,” 1997). And although Barkley did pay a cost for his aggression (he was arrested minutes after the assault), the benefits of his aggressive display may have outweighed these costs. When asked by reporters as he was being arrested if he had any regrets for throwing a man through a window, Barkley responded: “I regret we weren’t on a higher floor” (“Legend of Sir Charles,” 1999).

Bad Endings

Given these findings, this article has demonstrated the fruitfulness of combining theories from the area of motivational psychology (e.g., Eccles, 1983) and social cognition in the explanation of motivational variables like performance expectancies. Incorporating a functionalist ecological approach to early-stage social perception facilitates the development of psychological theories of social affiliation and exclusion and provides fertile ground for future empirical work. Besides establishing cultural differences in a novel domain, the present research may potentially stimulate new cross-cultural research in many other domains such as self perception, person perception, judgment and decision making, and persuasion. That said, we invite future studies that directly examine how individuals negotiate their goal priorities and self-presentation strategies at the interface of both cultural and individual values.

Good Endings

Thus, future research with more diverse and varied methodologies should continue to explore the relationship between living abroad and creativity. It may be that those critical months or years of turning cultural bewilderment into concrete understanding may instill not only the ability to “think outside the box” but also the capacity to realize that the box is more than a simple square, more than its simple form, but also a repository of many creative possibilities.

The world may not be a single global village, but a reminder of foreign villages is enough to temporarily bridge the division that exists between the villages that populate the globe.

Sometimes, even in loving, intimate relationships, it may pay to be cruel, or at least candid and honest, in order to be kind.

Bad Endings

It is doubtful that we, or any other researchers, would have thought to manipulate eye-gaze shifting, CS–US proximity, CS–US relative size, or the extent to which US were attitudinally evocative, were it not for consideration of the implications of our postulated model.

Second, the present Studies 3a and 3b also serve as good examples of how innovative statistical techniques such as the API (Campbell & Kashy, 2002; Kashy & Kenny, 2000; Kenny et al., 2006) can be used to study the effects of cultural influences in dyadic interaction studies. By partitioning these effects into actor effects and partner effects, researchers can determine how cultural influences directly affect the behaviors and social perceptions of actors and indirectly affect the behaviors and social perceptions of their interaction partners.
Bad Endings

- In view of these limitations, one important direction for future research is to apply the present approach in other places and in the context of other important life transitions, to help determine how suppression affects social functioning across a variety of life domains. In addition, it will be important to examine periods of life that are not marked by major transitions, to explore how the social consequences of expressive suppression are manifested in everyday life.
- As such, future research will be required to provide a complete understanding of the goal prioritization process. Integrating the goal priority concept into optimism research, however, should provide new avenues for exploration and theoretical integration.
- Thus, these effects are best described as constructive, knowledge-based biases that result from an interplay of comprehension and validation.

Before You Submit

- Choose the best journal you think might accept your paper. Aim high!
  - The more general the journal, the better.
  - The more subscribers, the better.
  - The higher the rejection rate, the better.
  - The higher the impact factor, the better.

  *Impact factor:* the average number of times articles published in the previous two years (e.g., 2006-2007) were cited in the most current full year (e.g. 2008).

- If you are unsure whether your manuscript is appropriate for a journal, send the Editor an email and abstract first.
  - If the Editor says yes, you have your foot in the door.
  - If the Editor says no, you saved yourself months of precious time.

- It is difficult to edit your own writing because you know what you meant to say and you understand the omitted steps.
- Get critiques from several colleagues (simulates the review process)
  - If they find something unclear, don’t argue with them. They are right! The writing is unclear.
  - Avoid the temptation to correct them verbally. Make the corrections in the manuscript in writing.
  - Your colleagues will be a lot nicer than the reviewers will be.

- Be sure to follow the journals’ *Guide to Authors* (e.g., word count, abstract length)
- If you don’t know the journal well, read some articles from it.
- Polish it, proof read it, then submit it!
  - Don’t expect reviewers to clean up your writing.
  - Reviewers look for excuses to reject your paper. One big excuse is that it was poorly written.
  - Good writing can go a long way in terms of getting your papers published.

Review Process

- Editor selects 1 to 5 anonymous reviewers
- Manuscript under review 1 to 6 months.
  - Do follow-up study during this time!
- Decision letters
  - Accept
  - Accept subject to revisions
  - Revise and resubmit
  - Reject
Please rate the manuscript on the following scales:
POOR=0   MARGINAL=1   ADEQUATE=2   EXCELLENT=3
1) __2__ Subject matter appropriate for Psychological Science
2) __2__ Importance of subject matter generally (if different)
3) __1__ Attention to relevant literature
4) __1__ Design of research
5) __2__ Analysis of data
6) __1__ Interpretation of results; discussion; conclusions
7) __1__ Clarity of presentation
8) __3__ Length, succinctness
9) __3__ Use of space for tables and figures

Recommendation:
_____ Accept as is
_____ Revise and resubmit (use sparingly)
_____ Accept subject to revisions
___X__ Reject

Review Process
- Rejection rates are generally 85-90%
- If you get a “revise and resubmit” decision, rejoice!
- If you get a reject, but think you can address the concerns (e.g., by conducting a new study), revise the manuscript and beg the Editor to reconsider it.
- Galleys (this is the time to make changes).
- Page proofs (only typos corrected)

Tell the Masses!
- Ordinary people do not read psychology journals. (My own Ph.D. students don’t even read my articles unless I force them to.)
- Write a press release to describe the results of your research in very simple, short statements. Use “sound bites.”
- Your university might have a press person who writes press releases. If so, find out who it is. If not, write your own press release.