Selective attention to positive findings for enhancing the self-image of the researcher. The peer review process is often biased, favoring results that support the researcher's hypothesis. This bias can lead to the publication of results that may not be replicable. Researchers often have a tendency to emphasize and believe experiences that confirm their hypotheses, even if these experiences are not statistically significant. This selectivity in publication can skew the body of research and influence the conclusions drawn from it. The impact of this bias has been extensively documented in various fields of psychology, highlighting the need for more rigorous and transparent research practices.
METHOD
RESULTS

In this study, the researchers investigated the effects of early evaluation on learning outcomes. The results showed that students who received early evaluations performed better than those who did not. The control group, which did not receive early evaluations, showed no significant improvement in performance.

In addition to the control group, two experimental groups were also included. The first experimental group received early evaluations, while the second group received early evaluations and additional reinforcement. The results showed that the second experimental group had the highest performance, indicating the effectiveness of early evaluations and reinforcement.

Graph 1: Performance of Control and Experimental Groups

Graph 2: Performance of Experimental Groups with and without Reinforcement

The study concluded that early evaluations and reinforcement are effective tools in improving student performance. The results support the implementation of early evaluation and reinforcement in educational settings to enhance learning outcomes.
The analysis of the results revealed significant differences across various groups. The calculations showed that the Mann-Whitney U test was appropriate for comparing the outcomes. The data analysis indicated that the differences were not due to chance. Therefore, further studies are recommended to validate these findings.
### Table III: Several Models with an Amount of 2,000 Words Long

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Recommendation</th>
<th>30'</th>
<th>30'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date/Preference (1-4.5')</td>
<td>69'</td>
<td>74'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publication Phases

- **Data Collection**: Data is collected through various means such as surveys, interviews, and observations.
- **Data Analysis**: Data is analyzed using statistical methods and qualitative analysis techniques.
- **Result Interpretation**: Results are interpreted in the context of existing literature.
- **Conclusion**: Conclusions are drawn based on the analysis and interpretation of the data.
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### Methodology

The study employed a mixed-methods approach combining qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques. Data was collected through surveys, interviews, and document analysis. The results were analyzed using regression analysis and thematic analysis.
DISCUSSION
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