Bibliographie

Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Millsap, R. E. (2008). Doctoral training in statistics, measurement, and methodology in psychology: Replication and extension of Aiken, West, Sechrest, and Reno's (1990) survey of PhD programs in North America. *American Psychologist*, *63*(1), 32-50. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.1.32

Algina, J., Keselman, H. J., & Penfield, R. D. (2006). Confidence intervals for an effect size when variances are not equal. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, *5*(1), 2-13. https://doi.org/10.22237/jmasm/1146456060

Altman, D. G. (2005). Why we need confidence intervals. *World Journal of Surgery*, *29*(5), 554-556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-005-7911-0

American Psychological Association. (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association [APA]* (6^{e} éd.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Andersen, M. B., McCullagh, P., & Wilson, G. J. (2007). But what do the numbers really tell us?: Arbitrary metrics and effect size reporting in sport psychology research. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *29*(5), 664-672. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.5.664

Anderson, S. F., & Maxwell, S. E. (2016). There's more than one way to conduct a replication study: Beyond statistical significance. *Psychological Methods*, *21*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000051

Balluerka, N., Gómez, J., & Hidalgo, D. (2005). The controversy over null hypothesis significance testing revisited. *Methodology*, *1*(2), 55-70. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-1881.1.2.55

Blume, J. D., D'Agostino McGowan, L., Dupont, W. D., & Greevy, R. A. (2018). Second-generation *p*-values: Improved rigor, reproducibility, & transparency in statistical analyses. *PLoS One*, *13*(3), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188299

Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing likert data. *Journal of Extension*, *50*(2), 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728717

Box, G. E. (1954). Some theorems on quadratic forms applied in the study of analysis of variance problems, II. Effects of inequality of variance and of correlation between errors in the two-way classification. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, *25*(3), 484-498. https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177728717

Burriss, R. P., Troscianko, J., Lovell, P. G., Fulford, A. J., Stevens, M., Quigley, R., ... Rowland, H. M. (2015). Changes in women's facial skin color over the ovulatory cycle are not detectable by the human visual system. *PLoS One*, *10*(7), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130093

Button, K. S., Kounali, D., Thomas, L., Wiles, N. J., Peters, T. J., Welton, N. J., ... Lewis, G. (2015). Minimal clinically important difference on the Beck Depression Inventory-II according to the patient's perspective. *Psychological Medicine*, *45*(15), 3269-3279. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291715001270

Byrne, B. M. (1996). The status and role of quantitative methods in psychology: Past, present, and future perspectives. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, *37*(2), 76-80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0708-5591.37.2.76

Cain, M. K., Zhang, Z., & Yuan, K.-H. (2017). Univariate and multivariate skewness and kurtosis for measuring nonnormality: Prevalence, influence and estimation. *Behavior Research Methods*, *49*(5), 1716-1735. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0814-1

Coe, R. (2002). It's the effect size, stupid: What effect size is and why it is important. Papier présenté à la conférence annuelle de la British Educational Research Association, Université d'Exeter, Exeter, Royaume-Uni.

Cohen, J. (1965). Some statistical issues in psychological research. Dans B. B. Wolmann (éd.), *Handbook of Clinical Psychology* (pp. 95-121). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Counsell, A., & Harlow, L. (2017). Reporting practices and use of quantitative methods in Canadian journal articles in psychology. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, *58*(2), 140-147. https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000074

Croasmun, J. T., & Ostrom, L. (2011). Using likert-type scales in the social sciences. *Journal of Adult Education*, *40*(1), 19-22.

Cumming, G. (2013). Cohen's *d* needs to be readily interpretable: Comment on Shieh (2013). *Behavior Research Methods*, *45*(4), 968-971. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0392-4

Cumming, G., Fidler, F., Kalinowski, P., & Lai, J. (2012). The statistical recommendations of the American Psychological Association Publication Manual: Effect sizes, confidence intervals, and meta-analysis. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *64*(3), 138-146. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9536.2011.00037.x

Curtis, D. A., & Harwell, M. (1998). Training doctoral students in educational statistics in the United States: A national survey. *Journal of Statistics Education*, *6*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/10691898.1998.11910604

Delacre, M., Lakens, D., & Leys, C. (2017). Why psychologists should by default use Welch's *t*-test instead of Student's *t*-test. *International Review of Social Psychology*, *30*(1), 92-101. https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.82

Delacre, M., Leys, C., Mora, Y. L., & Lakens, D. (2019). Taking parametric assumptions seriously: Arguments for the use of Welch's *F*-test instead of the classical *F*-test in one-way ANOVA. *International Review of Social Psychology*, *32*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.198

Duran, R. P., Eisenhart, M. A., Erickson, F. D., Grant, C. A., Green, J. L., Hedges, L. V., & Schneider, B. L. (2006). Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications: American Educational Research Association. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(6), 33-40.

Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1993). *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. New York: Chapman & Hall.

Ellis, P. D. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes: Statistical power, meta-analysis, and the interpretation of research results*. Cambridge, Royaume-Uni: Cambridge University Press.

Erceg-Hurn, D. M., & Mirosevich, V. M. (2008). Modern robust statistical methods: an easy way to maximize the accuracy and power of your research. *American Psychologist*, *63*(7), 591-601. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.591

Everitt, B. S. (2001). *Statistics for psychologists: An intermediate course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4^{e} éd.). Washington, DC: Sage.

Finch, S., Cumming, G., & Thomason, N. (2001). Reporting of statistical inference in the Journal of Applied Psychology: Little evidence of reform. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *61*(2), 181-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640121971167

Fraas, J. W., & Newman, I. (2000). Testing for Statistical and Practical Significance: A Suggested Technique Using a Randomization Test. Papier présenté à la réunion annuelle de la Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chigago.

Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *2*(2), 156-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245919847202

Gignac, G. E., & Szodorai, E. T. (2016). Effect size guidelines for individual differences researchers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *102*, 74-78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.069

Glass, G. V., McGaw, B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). *Meta-analysis in Social Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Glass, G. V., Peckham, P. D., & Sanders, J. R. (1972). Consequences of failure to meet assumptions underlying the fixed effects analyses of variance and covariance. *Review of Educational Research*, *42*(3), 237-288. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543042003237

Golinski, C., & Cribbie, R. A. (2009). The expanding role of quantitative methodologists in advancing psychology. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, *50*(2), 83-90. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015180

Goulet-Pelletier, J.-C., & Cousineau, D. (2018). A review of effect sizes and their confidence intervals, Part I: The Cohen's *d* family. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *14*(4), 242-265. https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.14.4.p242

Greenhouse, S. W., & Geisser, S. (1959). On methods in the analysis of profile data. *Psychometrika*, *24*(2), 95-112. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289823

Grissom, R. J. (2000). Heterogeneity of variance in clinical data. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*(1), 155-165. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.68.1.155

Grissom, R. J., & Kim, J. J. (2001). Review of assumptions and problems in the appropriate conceptualization of effect size. *Psychological Methods*, *6*(2), 135-146. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.6.2.135

Grissom, R. J., & Kim, J. J. (2005). *Effect sizes for research: A broad practical approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hartley, J. (2014). Some thoughts on Likert-type scales. *International Journal of Clinical and Health psychology*, *14*(1), 83-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1697-2600(14)70040-7

Harwell, M. R. (1992). Summarizing Monte Carlo results in methodological research. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, *17*(4), 297-313. https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986017004297

Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (2014). *Research methods and statistics in psychology* (2^{e} éd.). Londres, Royaume-Uni: Sage.

Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hoekstra, R., Kiers, H., & Johnson, A. (2012). Are assumptions of well-known statistical techniques checked, and why (not)? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*(137), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00137

Howitt, D., & Cramer, D. (2017). *Understanding statistics in psychology with SPSS* (7^{e} éd.). Édimbourg: Pearson Education.

Huynh, C.-L. (1989). A Unified Approach to the Estimation of Effect Size in Meta-Analysis. Papier présenté à la réunion annuelle de l'American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Huynh, C.-L., & Feldt, L. S. (1976). Estimation of the Box correction for degrees of freedom from sample data in randomized block and split-plot designs. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, *1*(1), 69-82. https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986001001069

Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (ab)use them? *Medical Education*, *38*(12), 1217-1218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.02012.x

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, *7*(4), 396-403. https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975

Judd, C. M., McClelland, G. H., Ryan, C. S., Muller, D., & Yzerbyt, V. (2010). *Analyse des données: une approche par comparaison de modèles*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Kelley, K. (2005). The effects of nonnormal distributions on confidence intervals around the standardized mean difference: Bootstrap and parametric confidence intervals. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *65*(1), 51-69. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164404264850

Keselman, H. J., Algina, J., & Kowalchuk, R. K. (2001). The analysis of repeated measures designs: A review. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *54*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1348/000711001159357

Keselman, H. J., Algina, J., Lix, L. M., Wilcox, R. R., & Deering, K. N. (2008). A generally robust approach for testing hypotheses and setting confidence intervals for effect sizes. *Psychological Methods*, *13*(2), 110-129. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.13.2.110

Keselman, H. J., Huberty, C. J., Lix, L. M., Olejnik, S., Cribbie, R. A., Donahue, B., ... Keselman, J. C. (1998). Statistical practices of educational researchers: An analysis of their ANOVA, MANOVA, and ANCOVA analyses. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*(3), 350-386. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068003350

Keselman, H. J., & Rogan, J. C. (1980). Repeated measures F tests and psychophysiological research: Controlling the number of false positives. *Psychophysiology*, *17*(5), 499-503. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1980.tb00190.x

Kulinskaya, E., & Staudte, R. G. (2007). Confidence intervals for the standardized effect arising in the comparison of two normal populations. *Statistics in medicine*, *26*(14), 2853-2871. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.2751

Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in psychology*, *4*(863), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863

Lakens, D. (2016, 9 décembre). The 20% Statistician: TOST equivalence testing R package (TOSTER) and spreadsheet. Repéré à http://daniellakens.blogspot.com/2016/12/tost-equivalence-testing-r-package.html

Lakens, D. (2017). Equivalence tests: A practical primer for t tests, correlations, and meta-analyses. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*(4), 355-362. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617697177

Lakens, D., Scheel, A. M., & Isager, P. M. (2018). Equivalence testing for psychological research: A tutorial. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *1*(2), 259-269. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918770963

Lane, D. (2016). The assumption of sphericity in repeated-measures designs: What it means and what to do when it is violated. *Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *12*(2), 114-122. https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.12.2.p114

McCall, R. B., & Appelbaum, M. I. (1973). Bias in the analysis of repeated-measures designs: Some alternative approaches. *Child Development*, 401-415. https://doi.org/10.2307/1127993

Meyners, M. (2012). Equivalence tests–A review. *Food Quality and Preference*, *26*(2), 231-245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2012.05.003

Micceri, T. (1989). The unicorn, the normal curve, and other improbable creatures. *Psychological Bulletin*, *105*(1), 156-166. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.105.1.156

Mills, L., Abdulla, E., & Cribbie, R. (2010). Quantitative methodology research: Is it on psychologists' reading lists? https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.06.2.p052

Newman, I., Fraas, J. W., & Herbert, A. (2001). Testing Non-Nil Null Hypotheses with t Tests of Group Means: A Monte Carlo Study. Papier présenté à la réunion annuelle de la Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chigago, IL.

Nickerson, R. S. (2000). Null hypothesis significance testing: a review of an old and continuing controversy. *Psychological Methods*, *5*(2), 241-301. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989x.5.2.241

Nunnally, J. (1960). The place of statistics in psychology. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *20*(4), 641-650. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000401

O'Brien, R. G., & Kaiser, M. K. (1985). MANOVA method for analyzing repeated measures designs: an extensive primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(2), 316-333. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.316

Osborne, J. W., & Christianson, W. R. (2001). Educational Psychology from a Statistician's Perspective: A Review of the Quantitative Quality of Our Field. Papier présenté à la réunion annuelle de l'American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Pek, J., & Flora, D. B. (2018). Reporting effect sizes in original psychological research: A discussion and tutorial. *Psychological Methods*, *23*(2), 208-225. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000126

Peng, C.-Y. J., & Chen, L.-T. (2014). Beyond Cohen's d: Alternative effect size measures for between-subject designs. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *82*(1), 22-50. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2012.745471

Peng, C.-Y. J., Chen, L.-T., Chiang, H.-M., & Chiang, Y.-C. (2013). The impact of APA and AERA guidelines on effect size reporting. *Educational Psychology Review*, *25*(2), 157-209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9218-2

Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1992). When small effects are impressive. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 160-164. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.160

Quertemont, E. (2011). How to statistically show the absence of an effect. *Psychologica Belgica*, *51*(2), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.5334/pb-51-2-109

Quintana, S. M., & Maxwell, S. E. (1994). A Monte Carlo comparison of seven ε-adjustment procedures in repeated measures designs with small sample sizes. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, *19*(1), 57-71. https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986019001057

Rasch, D., Kubinger, K. D., & Moder, K. (2011). The two-sample t test: pre-testing its assumptions does not pay off. *Statistical papers*, *52*(1), 219-231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00362-009-0224-x

Raviv, E. (2014, 2 juin). Bias vs. Consistency. Repéré à https://eranraviv.com/bias-vs-consistency/

Rogers, J. L., Howard, K. I., & Vessey, J. T. (1993). Using significance tests to evaluate equivalence between two experimental groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*(3), 553-565. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.553

Ruxton, G. D. (2006). The unequal variance t-test is an underused alternative to Student's t-test and the Mann–Whitney U test. *Behavioral Ecology*, *17*(4), 688-690. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ark016

Schuirmann, D. J. (1987). A comparison of the two one-sided tests procedure and the power approach for assessing the equivalence of average bioavailability. *Journal of Pharmacokinetics and Biopharmaceutics*, *15*(6), 657-680.

Seaman, M. A., & Serlin, R. C. (1998). Equivalence confidence intervals for two-group comparisons of means. *Psychological Methods*, *3*(4), 403-411. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.403

Shieh, G. (2013). Confidence intervals and sample size calculations for the standardized mean difference effect size between two normal populations under heteroscedasticity. *Behavior Research Methods*, *45*(4), 955-967. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0320-7

Simonsohn, U., Nelson, L. D., & Simmons, J. P. (2014). P-curve: a key to the file-drawer. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(2), 534-547. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033242

Stout, D. E., & Ruble, T. L. (1995). Assessing the practical significance of empirical results in accounting education research: The use of effect size information. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *13*(3), 281-298. https://doi.org/10.1016/0748-5751(95)00010-J

Subedi, B. P. (2016). Using Likert type data in social science research: Confusion, issues and challenges. *International journal of contemporary applied sciences*, *3*(2), 36-49.

Sullivan, G. M., & Feinn, R. (2012). Using effect size—or why the P value is not enough. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *4*(3), 279-282. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1

Thompson, B., & Snyder, P. A. (1997). Statistical significance testing practices in the Journal of Experimental Education. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *66*(1), 75-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220979709601396

Tomczak, M., & Tomczak, E. (2014). The need to report effect size estimates revisited. An overview of some recommended measures of effect size. *Trends in Sport Sciences*, *21*(1), 19-25.

Vasey, M. W., & Thayer, J. F. (1987). The continuing problem of false positives in repeated measures ANOVA in psychophysiology: A multivariate solution. *Psychophysiology*, *24*(4), 479-486. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1987.tb00324.x

Wackerly, D. D., Mendenhall, W., & Scheaffer, R. L. (2008). *Mathematical Statistics with Applications* (7^e éd.). Belmont, USA: Brooks/Cole.

Welch, B. L. (1938). The significance of the difference between two means when the population variances are unequal. *Biometrika*, *29*(3), 350-362. https://doi.org/10.2307/2332010

Wilcox, R. R. (1994). Some results on the Tukey-McLaughlin and Yuen methods for trimmed means when distributions are skewed. *Biometrical Journal*, *36*(3), 259-273. https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.4710360302

Wilcox, R. R. (1998). How many discoveries have been lost by ignoring modern statistical methods? *American Psychologist*, *53*(3), 300-314. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.3.300

Wilcox, R. R. (2017). *Modern statistics for the social and behavioral sciences: A practical introduction*. New York: Chapman & Hall.

Wilkinson, L. (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, *54*(8), 594-604. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.8.594

Yuan, K.-H., Bentler, P. M., & Chan, W. (2004). Structural equation modeling with heavy tailed distributions. *Psychometrika*, *69*(3), 421-436.

Zimmerman, D. W. (2004). A note on preliminary tests of equality of variances. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *57*(1), 173-181. https://doi.org/10.1348/000711004849222