

Outstanding Research Award Rubric

The Outstanding Research Award recognizes rigorous and transparent research by graduate students. Empirical submissions will be evaluated for the quality of the research design, transparency of the reported results, and legitimacy of the statistical conclusions. There will be one round of judging for this award. Five winners will be chosen by a group of reviewers based on the merits of the entire application. Reviewers will be matched to appropriate applications based on keyword matches and field of work. **Applications will be mask reviewed based on the judging rubric below.**

Key Notes for Reviewers

- The quality of the research should be evaluated independent of the significance of the results (e.g., p -values smaller or greater than a cutoff). While issues with design and procedure may affect study results, *the statistical significance of results does not affect the quality of the research*.
- If an applicant reports multiple studies, their scores on the rubric should be “averages” of the extent to which they meet each criterion.
- Applicants appreciate your feedback! Please keep in mind that these studies are already completed, so helpful feedback includes suggestions for alternative (or additional) exploratory analyses, ideas for future studies, other studies/theories that can inform their work, issues to consider going forward, etc.

Please rate the following sections of the submission:

<u>Objectives (2 pts.)</u> Objective(s) or purpose of the study are clearly stated.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<u>Background (1 pt.)</u> Background information (such as previous studies or theories) is relevant to the study objective(s).	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<u>Hypotheses (2 pts.)</u> Hypotheses are logically supported and sufficiently motivated by background information or theory. If the study was exploratory and no hypotheses were formulated a priori, there is clear indication of this. <u>Note</u> It does not matter if the study was exploratory as long as this information is openly stated.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<u>Implications (2 pts.)</u> The theoretical or empirical implications of the study are identified or explained.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4

<p><u>Design (1 pt.)</u> The study design is identified and described (e.g., correlational, longitudinal, quasi-experimental, experimental).</p>	<p>Poor Acceptable Good Excellent</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>
<p><u>Variables (2 pts.)</u> All variables are operationalized appropriately (i.e., meet internal validity). Transformations (e.g., centering, dummy-coding) and indices (e.g., variables combined into an index), if any, are described.</p>	<p>Poor Acceptable Good Excellent</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>
<p><u>Sample (2 pts.)</u> Sample size is reported and explained, ideally using power or sensitivity analysis. If no power analysis is reported, there is a clear explanation for the number of participants (e.g., stopping rules based on similar studies). Excluded participants are reported and criteria for exclusion is explained.</p>	<p>Poor Acceptable Good Excellent</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>
<p><u>Measures I (2 pts.)</u> There is clear indication of whether the measures included in this report were the full-set or a subset of the measures completed by participants (e.g., "Participants in our study completed measures of X, Y and Z. The goal of this study was to examine the relationship between X and Y").</p>	<p>Poor Acceptable Good Excellent</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>
<p><u>Measures II (2 pts.)</u> There is a clear rationale for why the chosen measures address the research question and capture the intended constructs. This can be a brief explanation of what the measure aims to capture, or how it is appropriate for the present sample or research question. * If the study was experimental, appropriate control groups were used. ** If the study used scales, they are internally consistent (evidenced by factor analysis, omega coefficient, Cronbach's alpha).</p>	<p>Poor Acceptable Good Excellent</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>

<p><u>Model (2 pts.)</u></p> <p>The statistical model used to test the study objective(s) is clearly described (e.g., ANOVA, SEM, regression) and appropriate to test the research question(s).</p>	<table><tr><td>Poor</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	1	2	3	4
Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent						
1	2	3	4						
<p><u>Hypothesis tests (3 pts.)</u></p> <p>All hypotheses are addressed in the results section, including those with null findings.</p> <p>*** Tests that address questions not hypothesized a priori are clearly indicated as <u>exploratory</u>.</p> <p><i><u>Note</u> It does not matter if the tests were exploratory as long as this information is openly stated.</i></p>	<table><tr><td>Poor</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	1	2	3	4
Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent						
1	2	3	4						
<p><u>Results (2 pts.)</u></p> <p>Statistical results follow APA format (e.g., $p = .057$, not $p > .05$) and include effect sizes and confidence intervals whenever applicable.</p>	<table><tr><td>Poor</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	1	2	3	4
Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent						
1	2	3	4						
<p><u>Discussion of findings (3 pts.)</u></p> <p>Study interpretations are within the scope of the sampled population, the design, and the research findings. If the study was exploratory, the need for replication is addressed here.</p> <p><i><u>Note</u> The applicant should infer causality from research design and theory, <u>not</u> from statistical analyses or models. Generalizations beyond the study's sample or analyses are stated as part of future directions only.</i></p>	<table><tr><td>Poor</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	1	2	3	4
Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent						
1	2	3	4						
<p><u>Limitations (2 pts.)</u></p> <p>Study limitations are identified, and how they can be addressed is discussed.</p> <p><i><u>Note</u> Examples of limitations include failed manipulations, unreliable questionnaires, sample size, and samples that may not be appropriate to answer specific research questions (but that were chosen for constraints outside the researcher's control).</i></p>	<table><tr><td>Poor</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	1	2	3	4
Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent						
1	2	3	4						

<p><u>Impact (2 pts.)</u></p> <p>The research makes a broad impact by advancing our understanding of a topic (theory, subfield, discipline), lending itself to downstream applications/interventions for society/policy, opening new research questions, etc.</p> <p><u>Note</u> <i>The impact of the research is independent of whether hypotheses were supported using tests of significance.</i></p>	<table><tr><td>Poor</td><td>Acceptable</td><td>Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	1	2	3	4
Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent						
1	2	3	4						

<p>I recommend this work for the Outstanding Student Award</p> <p><u>Note</u> This item will not count toward the final score.</p>	<table><tr><td>No</td><td>Maybe</td><td>Yes</td><td>Absolutely!</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	No	Maybe	Yes	Absolutely!	1	2	3	4
No	Maybe	Yes	Absolutely!						
1	2	3	4						

Note that each item has a different weight. The final score will be the sum of the weighted scores, as follows:

Total Introduction Score [(Objective x 2) + (Background Rating x 1) + (Hypotheses x 2) + (Implications x 2)] = ____/35

Total Method Score [(Design x 1) + (Variables x 2) + (Sample x 2) + (Measures I x 2) + (Measures II x 2)] = ____/45

Total Results Score [(Model x 2) + (Hypothesis Tests x 3) + (Results x 2)] = ____/35

Total Discussion Score [(Discussion of Findings x 3) + (Limitations x 2) + (Impact x 2)] = ____/35

FINAL SCORE _____/150