

Considerations for Reporting Positive or Negative Findings in Psychology and Behavioral Research

Editorial

Daniel Maitland¹, Gabriel J. Sanders²

¹Morehead State University, Morehead KY, USA

²Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights KY, USA

Open Access

Published: November
20, 2021



Copyright, 2021 by the authors. Published by Pinnacle Science and the work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Research Directs in
Psychology and
Behavior: 2021,
Volume1 (Issue 1): 1

About Research Directs in Psychology and Behavior

Research Directs aims to provide authors at research and non-research institutions with an open access platform for scientific discovery that reduces cost barriers associated with traditional open access publishers. Research Directs in Psychology and Behavior (RDPB) has a moderately broad scope and the journal aims to enhance negative and positive findings¹ in the psychology and behavioral sciences. Topics can include, but are not limited to the following categories: behavioral, clinical, industrial, forensic and environmental psychology, mental health, addictions, counseling, psychiatric treatment and outcomes and many more topics in the field.

Unique to Research Directs is a manuscript type called *Direct Original Research*. This is a manuscript type designed to provide authors with a direct way to publish various types of data that avoids excessive citations and unnecessary jargon that may disrupt the promptness of peer-review. As always, quality is paramount in research and haste in today's fast-paced global environment is becoming imperative for scientific advancement. A *Direct Original Research* is the same as original research, but written in a concise manner with the goal of providing direct and citable research.

Positive and Negative Findings

To propagate scientific discovery, both significant and non-significant data is relevant in addition to positive and negative findings as discussed in an editorial by Martin and Clarke¹. Often times, non-significant research findings are not published nor survive peer-review. However, RDPB encourages authors to provide non-significant data when it supports or refutes competing or noncompeting theories as it is a critical component to improve psychology and behavioral research. The scientific process starts when competing theories collide and additional evidence is needed to support or refute plausible theories. In addition to the significance levels, or lack thereof, clinical significance is an important factor to consider when publishing science-related data psychology and behavior. If clinical significance is discovered, but not statistical significance, authors are encouraged to report the data and elaborate in detail regarding its scientific or applied value. Lastly, while large sample sizes are ideal, they are not always feasible and impactful findings can occur in case studies and studies with limited sample sizes. Thus, the journal welcomes data from all sample sizes because novel research, especially in the field of

psychology and behavior, can arise from unique samples and populations.

Methodology and Reporting Findings

The advancement of the field of psychology inherently involves multi-level (e.g., social factors, biological or neural factors, and behavioral factors) and multi-method exploration of outcomes of interest. Therefore, RDPB encourages authors to submit manuscripts across the full range of methodological approaches, including but not limited to cross-



sectional², longitudinal, and experimental approaches. Consistent with RDPB's approach to positive and negative findings, authors are encouraged to report effect-sizes³ in addition to significance tests. Thus, readers can appropriately contextualize the magnitude of findings in addition to the positive or negative results of the investigation.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the journal urges authors to focus on submitting manuscripts guided by scientifically sound methodologies. Therefore any findings, albeit positive, negative, significant or non-significant can stand on a strong methodological foundation. Research Directs in Psychology and Behavior is committed to developing an internationally recognized peer-reviewed journal that promotes scientific discovery via impactful research. A growing body of research and editorials have been published to suggest the need for data to be reported as is, even if the results reveal significant or non-significant outcomes and RDPB is in support of these findings⁴⁻⁸.

References

1. Martin GN, Clarke RM. Are Psychology Journals Anti-replication? A Snapshot of Editorial Practices. *Front Psychol.* 2017;8:523. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00523
2. Spector PE. Do Not Cross Me: Optimizing the Use of Cross-Sectional Designs. *J Bus Psychol.* 2019;34(2):125-137. doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8
3. Sullivan GM, Feinn R. Using Effect Size-or Why the P Value Is Not Enough. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2012;4(3):279-282. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1
4. de Souza LML, Cabral HV, de Oliveira LF, Vieira TM. Motor units in vastus lateralis and in different vastus medialis regions show different firing properties during low-level, isometric knee extension contraction. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2018;58:307-314. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2017.12.012
5. Arunachalam L, Hunter IA, Killeen S. Reporting of Randomized Controlled Trials With Statistically Nonsignificant Primary Outcomes Published in High-impact Surgical Journals. *Ann Surg.* 2017;265(6):1141-1145. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000001795
6. Chuard PJC, Vrtilek M, Head ML, Jennions MD. Evidence that nonsignificant results are sometimes preferred: Reverse P-hacking or selective reporting. *PLoS biology.* 2019;17(1). doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000127
7. Gates S, Ealing E. Reporting and interpretation of results from clinical trials that did not claim a treatment difference: survey of four general medical journals. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(9). doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024785
8. Hazell L, Shakir SAW. Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions. *Drug Safety.* 2006;29:385-396. doi: 10.2165/00002018-200629050-00003