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The Five Stages
Of Manuscript Rejection
10. **Show no evidence of familiarity with the journal.**

- Does the paper fit the journal in terms of topic area?
- Does the paper fit with the journal’s theoretical and/or methodological orientation?
- Who is on the editorial board?
- Is the journal ever cited in your references?
- Have you patterned your manuscript after exemplary articles you’ve read in this journal?

9. **Write badly.**

- Is there a clear and efficient thread carrying throughout the paper, from theoretical framing to methods to discussion and conclusions?
- Is the paper free from long-windedness and over-writing (e.g., as when paring back a dissertation for publication)?
- Has the paper been proofread, especially when authors have English as a second language?
8. Ignore attention to detail and conventions of style.

- Is the paper free from typos, misspellings, and internal referencing errors (e.g., wrong table mentioned, or text citations not appearing in the references)?
- Have you followed APA style perfectly, including any specific deviations from convention for this particular journal?

7. Have weak and/or incomplete theoretical foundations.

- Is the place that your paper fits in – the contribution it will make – made explicit for the reader?
- Have you missed citing key papers?
- Did you forget “critical” work by scholars on the editorial board?
- Have you left out systematic portions of the literature (e.g., from adjacent but relevant fields, or from competing theoretical perspectives)?
6. Violate fundamental principles of sound research design – *internal validity*.

- Have you ruled out, or at least addressed, alternate explanations for your findings?
  - History, Maturation, Testing, Instrumentation, Selection, Mortality, Regression
- Have you included all relevant control variables (covariates)?

5. Violate fundamental principles of sound research design – *external validity*.

- Have you made clear the extent to which you planned, and then in the end expect, your results to generalize?
  - People
  - Places
  - Settings
  - Times
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4. Use lousy scales / measures / instruments.

• If you have selected or adapted existing instruments, have you presented evidence of their validity and reliability for the population(s) and contexts you are studying?

• If you have developed your own instruments, have you provided evidence that you have followed best practices for scale construction?

3. Write as though yours is the first completely flawless study.

• Have you disclosed all known limitations associated with the current study?

• Have you made clear why those limitations were unavoidable?

• Have you explained if and how those study limitations temper the study’s inferences?
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2. Ignore comments by the reviewers and/or editor.

- Have you responded (politely) to every concern raised by the reviewers and editor?
- Have you kept to the editor’s requested timelines, or requested extensions when things are taking longer?
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1. Mess up the selection, execution, and/or communication of the quantitative methods used.

- Did you use methods that directly address your hypotheses and facilitate the target inferences?
- Did you address sample size / power / effect size?
- Did you check the method’s assumptions or explain why violations would not compromise inference?
- Did you provide sufficient detail (and justification) regarding the analyses so another person could replicate them given the data?
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Hancock, G. R., & Mueller, R. O. (Eds.) (2010).
The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods

"I enthusiastically support this book. I predict it will be used in
the same way as the APA's Publication Manual."
Schuyler Huck, University of Tennessee

"Who should buy this book? Everyone who has ever or will ever
review a paper that uses statistics outside of the reviewer's
expertise; in short, everyone."
David L. Streiner, Baycrest Centre and University of Toronto

"Reviewers and producers of quantitative research need to have
this book on their bookshelf."
Jeffrey A. Greene, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

"Every social sciences researcher should own a copy ... I'd give
this book 6 stars if I could."
Rick, Virginia Beach, VA, Amazon.com customer

Quantitative Methods:
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Chapters covering 31
classic and emerging
quantitative methods,
written by experts who
can actually write.
Table listing criteria (desiderata) that should be considered when evaluating or applying that method.

Detailed explication of each desideratum, with additional references as needed.
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1. ANOVA: Between-Groups Designs
2. ANOVA: Repeated Measures Designs
3. Canonical Correlation Analysis
4. Cluster Analysis
5. Correlation and Other Measures of Association
6. Discriminant Analysis
7. Effect Sizes and Confidence Intervals
8. Factor Analysis: Exploratory and Confirmatory
9. Generalizability Theory
10. Hierarchical Linear Modeling
11. Interrater Reliability
12. Item Response Theory
13. Latent Class Analysis
14. Latent Growth Curve Models
15. Latent Transition Analysis
16. Latent Variable Mixture Models
17. Logistic Regression
18. Log-Linear Analysis
19. Meta-Analysis
20. Multidimensional Scaling
21. Multiple Regression
22. Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis
23. Multivariate Analysis of Variance
24. Power Analysis
25. Reliability and Validity of Instruments
26. Research Design
27. Single-Subject Design and Analysis
28. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)
29. SEM: Multisample Covariance and Mean Structures
30. Survey Sampling, Administration, and Analysis
31. Survival Analysis
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Qualitative companion volume currently in progress:
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