

**Award Category: Empirical OR Review**

<b>Outstanding Research Award Rubric</b>		<b>Score 1 (Not At All) – 5 (Extremely)</b>	
		<b>IF APPLICABLE: Rate any subsequent studies using the same criteria. Please label your ratings clearly. Leave this column blank if only one study was reported.</b>	<b>IF APPLICABLE: Enter the mean of the submission’s studies. Leave this column blank if only one study was reported.</b>
<b>1. Background and Objectives/Hypotheses</b>		<b>Main Study</b>	
A. The study objective(s) is(are) clearly stated.			
B. Background information, such as previous studies or theories, is comprehensive and relevant to the study objective(s).			
C. Hypotheses are logically supported by background information ( <b>Empirical Submissions Only</b> )			
D. The value or scientific novelty of the study’s objective(s) is(are) identified and explained. Examples include its utility for a particular application or how it will provide a better understanding of a particular construct, method, or theory.			
<b>INTRODUCTION SUBSCORE</b>			
<b>2a. Methods (Empirical Submissions ONLY)</b>			
A. Determination of sample size is clearly discussed and consideration is given to the power of the study. Examples include a discussion of power calculation or references to effect sizes from previous studies investigating similar questions.			
B. Methods (including data collection, experimental design, controls, measures) used to address the study’s objective(s) are appropriate. Appropriate methods can be indicated by using methods from previous studies that have investigated similar questions or been used to measure a relevant construct.			
C. Methods used demonstrate high validity. Examples include measuring the intended construct (i.e., construct validity), appropriately using control groups (i.e., internal validity), and having generalizable results (i.e., external validity). <i>Note: Not all types of validity might be applicable.</i>			
<b>EMPIRICAL METHODOLOGY SUBSCORE</b>			

<b>2b. Methods (Review Submissions ONLY)</b>			
A. The study integrates multiple theories together by discussing their similarities and differences. This may include compiling extensive evidence which supports one theory while refuting another, or identifying conditions under which each competing theory is supported.			
<b>REVIEW METHODOLOGY SUBSCORE</b>			
<b>3. Results (Empirical Submissions ONLY)</b>			
A. Statistical technique(s) used to test the study objective(s) are clearly described and appropriate to test the research question(s). Examples include making causal inferences and assessing complex relationships.			
B. Statistics of major results are reported in APA format (e.g., p-values) and include effect sizes or confidence intervals when possible.			
<b>EMPIRICAL RESULTS SUBSCORE</b>			
<b>4. Conclusions</b>			
A. Reasonable conclusions are drawn from the data. In particular, the author discusses whether and how their findings support the study's hypotheses and relate to prior research or theory. <u>Note</u> : It does not matter whether or not the study's hypotheses are actually supported; only that the author does not make conclusions that go beyond their data. <b>(Empirical Submissions ONLY)</b>			
B. Study limitations are mentioned and ways they can be improved on in future work are discussed. Examples of limitations include failed manipulations, few survey items, and sample size. <b>(Empirical Submissions ONLY)</b>			
C. The study proposes a new perspective or theoretical framework that extends beyond a summary of past work. <b>(Review Submission ONLY)</b>			
D. The research makes a broad impact. Examples of broad impacts include findings which lend themselves to downstream applications/interventions for society or policy, or make substantial advances in the understanding of one's respective area of psychological research, or other disciplines.			
<b>CONCLUSIONS/FUTURE WORK SUBSCORE</b>			
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> <i>(30 points possible for Review Submissions, 60 points possible for Empirical Submissions)</i>			

On a scale of 1 (Not At All) to 5 (Extremely), would you recommend this submission for an Outstanding Research Award? \_\_\_\_\_

Optional Comments: Please consider providing feedback on parts of the submission that were done exceptionally well, areas for improvement, and any suggestions you have for making those improvements.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---