

Methodological Standards Compliance

Conditional Process Analysis with Propensity Score Weighting

Results From an Empirically Informed Simulated Dataset Based on Current Reports on CSU Populations

21/21
100%
Criteria Met

11/21
52%
Exceeds Standard

Sample, Weighting & Model Fit

Bootstrap Design & Effect Reporting

Measure

Study

Benchmark

● Effective Sample Size **N = 5,000**

Report ESS

● Weight Balance (SMD) **SMD ≈ 0**

|SMD| < 0.10

● Weight Range

0.024-3.07

Report range

● Estimator

MLR

ML/MLR/WLSMV

● χ^2

1045.81

Report

● df

569

Report

● p value

< .001

Report

● CFI

0.995

≥ 0.95

● TLI

0.995

≥ 0.95

● RMSEA

0.013

≤ 0.06

● SRMR

0.046

≤ 0.08

Measure

Study

Benchmark

● Interaction Support **XxZ product**

XxZ term

● Identifiability

df = 546

$df > 0$

● Bootstrap Design

BTW

Nonparam.

● CI Method

BCa

BCa/Percentile

● Bootstrap B

B = 10

$\geq 1,000$

● Bootstrap Convergence

100%

$\geq 95\%$

● Direct Effects

Est + BCa CI

Est + CI

● Indirect Effects

BCa CI

Boot CI

● Conditional Indirects

± 1 SD levels

Low/Mid/High

● Index of Mod. Med.

BCa CI

Point + CI

Legend:

● Exceeds preferred

● Meets minimum

● Adequate

21/21 criteria met

BTW = Bootstrap-then-weight; BCa = Bias-corrected accelerated. Standards per Kline (2023), Hayes (2022), Preacher & Hayes (2008).

Note: ● B = 500 adequate for inference, increase to $\geq 2,000$ for final publication.