

Reviewer Instructions 17th International Conference on Motivation

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for agreeing to review proposals submitted for consideration at the 17th International Conference on Motivation (ICM), i.e., the bi-annual conference of the EARLI-Special Interest Group "Motivation and Emotion" (SIG8) 2022 in Dresden. We highly appreciate the time and effort you will invest in helping us to prepare an inspiring conference!

Please evaluate the quality of each proposal according to the criteria given below on a scale from 0 (*inadequate*) to 10 (*outstanding*). Your individual ratings will be weighted and combined in a total score. In addition, please provide brief and constructive feedback in the corresponding text box, taking into account the efforts invested in writing a proposal. Scores and feedback will be both communicated to the authors along with the final decision. At least two reviewers will blindly review each proposal.

In order to be able to provide feedback to potential participants as soon as possible, we kindly ask you to submit your reviews by 4th of March at the latest. If you are unable to meet this deadline and will require slightly more time, please let us know. To submit your reviews, please log in to your EARLI account via <https://www.earli-eapril.org/>, select "My Reviews" and choose "SIG8-Motivation meets SIG16-Metacognition conference: Dresden".

Dates to remember

February 07th, 2022	Start of review process
March 04th, 2022	Review deadline (first round)
March 15th, 2022	Review deadline (second round – for cases with divergent review results)
March 20th, 2022	Notification of acceptance

Please be advised that there are both empirical and theoretical submissions. **Please note that the review system does not allow us to use different review criteria for different types of submissions. Accordingly, you will see in the system that some criteria include qualifiers like "OR" in order to use different criteria for empirical vs. theoretical submissions.** In order to communicate the criteria as clearly as possible, the review criteria for empirical and theoretical submissions are explained below separately.

Single Paper or Poster

Empirical Paper or Poster

- Relevance for the conference theme
- Clarity of objectives and research questions
- Strong rationale for the study (well-grounded in existent theoretical frameworks and/or empirical work)
- Research methods and design (participants, material, data sources/measures, sampling, procedure)
- Clarity of (planned) data analyses, (preliminary) results, and conclusions
- Your overall assessment of the quality of the proposal

Theoretical Paper or Poster

- Relevance for the conference theme
- Clarity of objectives and research questions
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale, or pragmatic grounding
- Embeddedness in the relevant literature
- Clarity and robustness of theoretical arguments
- Your overall assessment of the quality of the proposal

Symposium

Symposia provide an opportunity to present research on one topic, compiling a coherent set of papers for discussion. Symposia are evaluated **both** as a whole and as individual contributions.

Symposium as a whole

- Relevance for the conference theme
- Clarity of objectives and research questions
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale, or pragmatic grounding
- Organization and coherence of the whole symposium
- Your overall assessment of the quality of the symposium

Paper in a symposium

Please evaluate each paper in a symposium as an individual paper using the criteria for **single papers**.

Just a short reminder: Please score each criterion on a scale from 0 – 10. The meanings of the scale points is as follows:

- 0 to 3 = inadequate
- 4 = unacceptable
- 5 = mediocre
- 6 = sufficient
- 7 = distinctive
- 8 = good
- 9 = excellent
- 10 = outstanding

For any questions regarding the review process, please contact the organization team at info@SIG8meetsSIG16-Dresden.de.