We are now accepting nominations for the *Gifted Child Quarterly* Paper of the Year award for Volume *64*! Please submit your nomination at https://tinyurl.com/GCQPaperofYearVol64. Nominations are due no later than <u>January 31.</u> Details about the process are below.

Nominations for articles for the *GCQ* Paper of the Year are being solicited by the Editors from members of the NAGC Publications Committee, the pool of *GCQ* reviewers, as well as past editors of *GCQ* and the chair of the Research and Evaluation Network. We also solicit nominations from the NAGC general membership. Note that self-nominations are limited to the first author of the article. All articles must have been published in Volume 64. Those published OnlineFirst but not yet in print are not eligible.

The 4 to 6 papers most frequently nominated will be considered for the award.

A *GCQ* Paper of the Year award committee will be appointed by the Editors, in consultation with the Association Editor. Each committee member will rank the papers based on the rubric below, and the Editors will use the reviewers' ratings to identify the *GCQ* Paper of the Year.

NOTE: The following criteria are to be used for the evaluation of papers that are under consideration for the *GCQ* Paper of the Year Award. Please note that for each topic area, benchmark criteria are provided that should be used for your evaluation. In some cases, scale ratings have not been defined so as to allow for the situations where the paper does not fully meet the provided criteria.

Topic Relevance and Importance (1- 5 Scale):

5: The article topic is relevant and important to a broad range of the *GCQ* readership. The article provides findings that significantly impact the field of gifted and talented education and/or the development of gifted students. That is, the findings can be immediately built upon, i.e., implemented immediately in practice, basic research, or policy implementation.

3: The article topic is important and relevant but to a limited *GCQ* readership. The article's findings may potentially impact the field, but additional study of the area is warranted.

1: The article topic is limited in terms of its importance and relevance to the *GCQ* readership. The findings of the article will likely have little to no impact for the field of gifted and talented education and/or the development of gifted students.

Innovation (1-3 Scale):

3: The article provides new, unique, or alternative understandings of the topic, with the potential for furthering thought and/or research within the field of gifted and talented education.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
Gifted Children

2. The article provides important extension of the findings on a topic to other populations or in other contexts that enhance the generalizability or further understandings.

1: The article verifies current understandings of the topic but does not provide new insights on or generalizations about the topic.

Validity of Idea (1-3 Scale):

3: The article supports the intellectual quality of its focus by providing a convincing rationale supported by (1) current (and/or seminal if appropriate) theory and research and (2) relevant literature within and/or outside the field of gifted and talented education.

1: The article is built upon a rationale supportive of its focus with only limited literature within and/or outside the field of gifted and talented education

Methodology (1-3 Scale):

3: The research design and all procedures implemented are appropriate relative to the research question(s) posited, thus the findings provide for rigorous evidence for the topic under study, ruling out alternative explanations for the results (where applicable). All procedures relative to participants (where applicable), data collection (where applicable), and data analysis are appropriate given the question(s) posed, thus providing findings that have generalizability. The authors use the most sophisticated, yet appropriate, data analysis techniques.

1: The research design and procedures implemented are closely aligned with the research question(s) posited, although more sophisticated analysis techniques could have been applied. Or, there are threats (e.g., extraneous variables, weak instrumentation, limited sample) not fully accounted for that limit the generalizability or transferability of findings.

Quality of Writing (1-3 Scale):

3: The writing style of the article is engaging and appropriate for the topic and the *GCQ* readership using language that takes readers to a new level of understanding. The writing is clearly focused, purposeful and leads to key points or conclusions. The article is technically sound, but results and discussion are accessible to a broad range of *GCQ* readers. Language and style make the article more elegant than one would normally expect.

2: The writing style of the article is appropriate for the topic and the *GCQ* readership. The article is readable, concise, and cohesive.

1: The writing style conveys critical information but is either too verbose and/or complex for interpretation by most readers or it does not provide enough detail or explanation to make the results easily interpretable.

The following articles in *Volume 64* are eligible for nomination:

January 2020, Volume 64, Issue 1

Cognitive and achievement characteristics of students from a national sample identified as potentially twice exceptional (gifted with a learning disability)
by Danika L. S. Maddocks
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219886668

Supports for youth in accelerated high school curricula: An initial study of applicability and acceptability of a motivational interviewing intervention
by Lindsey M. O'Brennan, Shannon M. Suldo, Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick, Robert F. Dedrick, Janise S. Parker, Jon S. Lee, John M. Ferron, & Camille Hanks
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219886933

Making meaning out of MANOVA: The need for multivariate post hoc testing in gifted education research [Methodological brief]
by Kendal N. Smith, Kristen N. Lamb, & Robin K. Henson
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219890352

MANOVA: A procedure whose time has passed? [Methodological brief]
by Francis L. Huang
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219887200

April 2020, Volume 64, Issue 2 (Special Issue: Underachievement and Achievement Motivation)

Gifted underachievement and achievement motivation: The promise of breaking silos [Editorial]
by Kate E. Snyder and Stephanie V. Wormington
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220909179

An expectancy-value approach to math underachievement: Examining high school achievement, college attendance, and STEM interest
by Carlton J. Fong and Kristen P. Kremer
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219890599

Telling a tale: How underachievement develops in gifted girls
by Ophélie Allyssa Desmet, Nielsen Pereira, and Jean S. Peterson
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219888633

Pay attention to inattention: Exploring ADHD symptoms in a sample of underachieving gifted students
by D. Betsy McCoach, Del Siegle, and Lisa DaVia Rubenstein
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219901320

Gifted students' adjustment and underachievement in university: An exploration from the Self-Determination Theory perspective
by Ainur Almukhambetova and Daniel Hernández-Torrano
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220905525

The effectiveness of current interventions to reverse the underachievement of gifted students: Findings of a meta-analysis and systematic review
by Saiying Steenbergen-Hu, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, and Eric Calvert
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220908601

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
Gifted Children

July 2020, Volume 64, Issue 3

Differences in using the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) 7 Nonverbal Battery versus the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT) 2 to identify the gifted/talented
by Carol A. Carman, Christine A. P. Walther, & Robert A. Bartsch
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220921164

Cyberbullying and Internet addiction in gifted and nongifted teenagers
by Inmaculada Sureda Garcia, Raül López Penádes, Rosabel Rodríguez Rodríguez, & Jaume Sureda Negre
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220919338

Factors related to suicidal cognitions of academically gifted students in the Chinese social–cultural context: An exploratory study
by Xinjie Chen, Xitao Fan, Joseph Wu, & Hoi Yan Cheung
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220923665

Differentiating among high-achieving learners: A comparison of classical test theory and Item Response Theory on above-level testing
by Brandon LeBeau, Susan G. Assouline, Duhita Mahatmya, & Ann Lupkowski-Shoplik
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220924050

October 2020, Volume 64, Issue 4

Factors associated with gifted identification for ethnically diverse children in poverty
by Courtney Ricciardi, Allison Haag-Wolf, & Adam Winsler https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220937685

Test-taking for gifted and talented Kindergarten: Underscoring the importance of outreach
by Ying Lu, Sharon L. Weinberg, and Meghan McCormick
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220941587

Galton, Terman, Cox: The distinctive Volume II in Genetic Studies of Genius
by Dean Keith Simonton
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220921360

Similarities and differences between intellectually gifted and average-ability students in school performance, motivation, and subjective well-being
by Sebastian Bergold, Linda Wirthwein, & Ricarda Steinmayr
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220932533

What's in your gifted education online teacher professional development? Incorporating theory- and practice-based elements of instructional learning design
by Matthew J. Edinger
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220938051

Reducing levels of perfectionism in gifted and talented youth through a mindfulness intervention
by Sophia Olton-Weber, Robyn Hess, & Jennifer A. Ritchotte
https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220953392