

Notes	0 Insufficient	1 Sufficient	1,5 Excellent
<b>1. Data(set) description</b>			
150 words	No citation for the data source; No descriptive statistics; No explanation of the data and/or the variables analyzed; Dataset not suitable; Word count exceeded.	Dataset is suitable; Data source is cited; The data and variables analyzed are explained; Descriptive statistics provided	Very clear and succinct description that shows good understanding; Extra effort applied to finding unique data and/or processing and cleaning the data
<b>2. Research question and theoretical latent variable model</b>			
150 words	Missing or malformed research question; Theoretical model is not described well enough to interpret the results; Theoretical model does not match the RQ; Word count exceeded.	A relevant research question is clearly stated; The theoretical model matches the RQ and is well-defined but perhaps not extensively enough to fully replicate the analysis.	The research question is particularly interesting or unique; The theoretical model is rigorously defined with path diagrams and/or equations; The model can be reproduced based on only this description.
<b>3. Estimate the model (lavaan)</b>			
	Model syntax is not provided; The estimates reported do not match the syntax provided	The model defined by the syntax correctly answers the research question and matches the reported results; The relevant syntax is provided with the report and very little extraneous code is included.	The syntax provided in the appendix is formatted and annotated especially clearly; No extraneous syntax is included.
<b>4. Rationale for important modeling decisions</b>			
300 words	Not all important decisions explained and/or some explanations or arguments are clearly wrong. Assumptions not checked or checked/evaluated incorrectly; Word count exceeded.	The rationale given for important modeling decisions is clear and makes sense; The choice for EFA/CFA/PCA is well-motivated. Assumptions are discussed and interpreted.	Particularly well-reasoned and nuanced explanations are given for important modeling decisions; The explanations show a deep understanding of the details underlying the methods employed.
<b>5. Reporting and interpreting results in APA style</b>			
	Results not interpreted or interpreted incorrectly; Applicable measures of model fit not included; Results are included by copying/embedding R output.	Results are reported in APA style and interpreted correctly. Measures of model fit are included and discussed. Results are included as correctly typeset in-text statistics or as APA-formatted tables or figures.	All (and only) relevant results and model fit indices are reported and interpreted; Extra attention is applied to formatting tables and figures to optimize clarity; The selection of reported results shows a clear understanding of what information is important.
<b>6. Discussion of results</b>			
300 words	The research question is not answered; The results are repeated without any additional interpretation or discussion to link the results to the RQ; Word count exceeded.	Results are discussed clearly, and the RQ is clearly answered through this discussion; Strengths and limitations of the analysis are considered.	The discussion is especially nuanced and insightful (e.g., tying up all "loose ends" by cogently linking each aspect of the results with the RQ); The discussion of strengths and limitations shows a clear understanding of the relative importance of different design decisions and justifies the trade-offs made in the analysis.
<b>Formatting &amp; Submission</b>			
	Gross differences from the required format (e.g., wrong file type, missing sections, submitting multiple files, missing title page or information thereon).	All formatting and submission procedures satisfied.	N/A