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	11/21
100%	52%
Criteria Met	**Exceeds Standard**

Sample, Weighting & Model Fit

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
● χ²	**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

Bootstrap Design & Effect Reporting

Measure	Study	Benchmark
● Interaction Support	**X×Z product**	X×Z term
● Identifiability	**df = 546**	df > 0
● Bootstrap Design	**BTW**	Nonparam.
● CI Method	**BCa**	BCa/Percentile
◑ Bootstrap B	**B = 10**	≥ 1,000
● Bootstrap Convergence	**100%**	≥ 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 ≥ 2,000 for final publication.

Process-SEM Dissertation Study | Developmental Adjustment among Accelerated Dual Credit Students