

We are now accepting nominations for the *Gifted Child Quarterly* Paper of the Year award for Volume 65! Please submit your nomination at <https://bit.ly/GCQPOY2021>. Nominations are due no later than June 15, 2022. Details about the process are below.

Nominations for articles for the *GCQ* Paper of the Year are being solicited by the incoming Editor 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 65. 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 incoming Editor, in consultation with the Association Editor. Each committee member will rank the papers based on the rubric below, and the incoming Editor 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.

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 65* are eligible for nomination (all accepted under the editorship of Jill Adelson and Michael Matthews):

Gifted Child Quarterly

Volume 65 Issue 1, January 2021

Intellectual Precocity: What Have We Learned Since Terman?

David Lubinski, Camilla P. Benbow

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220925447>

Social–Emotional Characteristics and Adjustment of Accelerated University Students: A Systematic Review

Jolande Schuur, Marjolijn van Weerdenburg, Lianne Hoogeveen, Evelyn H. Kroesbergen

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220969392>

College Choice: Considerations for Academically Advanced High School Seniors

Melanie S. Meyer, Jeff Cranmore, Anne N. Rinn, Jaret Hodges

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220957258>

Do Mass Media Shape Stereotypes About Intellectually Gifted Individuals? Two Experiments on Stigmatization Effects From Biased Newspaper Reports

Sebastian Bergold, Matthias R. Hastall, Ricarda Steinmayr

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220969393>

Assessing the Scholarly Reach of Terman’s Work

Jaret Hodges, Rachel U. Mun, Mattie E. Oveross, Jessica K. Ottwein

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220928322>

Volume 65 Issue 2, April 2021

Identifying and Serving Gifted and Talented Students: Are Identification and Services Connected?

E. Jean Gubbins, Del Siegle, Karen Ottone-Cross, D. Betsy McCoach, Susan Dulong Langley, Carolyn M. Callahan, Annalissa V. Brodersen, Melanie Caughey

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220988308>

Building Systemic Capacity to Improve Identification and Services in Gifted Education: A Case Study of One District

Rachel U. Mun, Miriam D. Ezzani, Lindsay Ellis Lee, Jessica K. Ottwein

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986220967376>



Finding Talent Among Elementary English Learners: A Validity Study of the HOPE Teacher Rating Scale

Nielsen Pereira

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986220985942>

Trends in Gender Disparities Among High-Achieving Students in Mathematics: An Analysis of the American Mathematics Competition (AMC)

A. Kadir Bahar

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986220960453>

Achievement Across the Life Span: Perspectives From the Terman Study of the Gifted

Carole K. Holahan

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986220934401>

Volume 65 Issue 3, July 2021

A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test: Exploring Its Validity Evidence and Effectiveness in Equitably Identifying Gifted Students

Hyeseong Lee, Nesibe Karakis, Bekir Olcay Akce, Abdullah Azzam Tuzgen, Sareh Karami, Marcia Gentry, Yukiko Maeda

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986221997800>

Perfectionism and the Imposter Phenomenon in Academically Talented Undergraduates

Lindsay Ellis Lee, Anne N. Rinn, Kacey Crutchfield, Jessica K. Ottwein, Jaret Hodges, Rachel U. Mun

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986220969396>

After the International Mathematical Olympiad: The Educational/Career Decisions and the Development of Mathematical Talent of Former Australian Olympians

Jae Yup Jung, Jihyun Lee

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986221991160>

The Career Intentions of Gifted English as a Foreign Language High School Students in Vietnam

Thuy Hong Cao, Jae Yup Jung, Susen Smith

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0016986221991166>

Developing Leadership Talent in Adolescents and Emerging Adults: A Systematic Review

Melanie S. Meyer, Anne N. Rinn

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00169862211007556>

Volume 65 Issue 4, October 2021

Gifted Adolescent Readers' Perceptions of How Teachers Should (or Should Not) Listen During Dialogic Discourse

Cindy M. Gilson, Adrienne E. Sauder

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00169862211009856>



Educator Perceptions Following Changes in Gifted Education Policy: Implications for Serving Gifted Students

Jaret Hodges, Rachel U. Mun, Javetta Jones Roberson, Charles “Tedd” Flemister

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00169862211023796>

Assessing the Universality of the Zero Originality Lists of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT)-Figural: An Examination With African American College Students

Selcuk Acar, Marcus J. Branch, Cyndi Burnett, John F. Cabra

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00169862211012964>

The International Cognitive Ability Resource: A Free Cognitive Measure With Utility for Postsecondary Giftedness Research

Stephanie R. Young, Danika L. S. Maddocks, Jamison E. Carrigan

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00169862211023775>

