

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

Measure	Study	Benchmark
<div></div> Effective Sample Size	N = 3,000	Report ESS
<div></div> Weight Balance (SMD)	SMD ≈ 0	SMD < 0.10
<div></div> Weight Range	0.024-3.07	Report range
<div></div> Estimator	MLR	ML/MLR/WLSMV
<div></div> χ^2	930.69	Report
<div></div> df	546	Report
<div></div> p value	< .001	Report
<div></div> CFI	0.977	≥ 0.95
<div></div> TLI	0.975	≥ 0.95
<div></div> RMSEA	0.015	≤ 0.06
<div></div> SRMR	0.022	≤ 0.08

Bootstrap Design & Effect Reporting

Measure	Study	Benchmark
<div></div> Interaction Support	X×Z product	X×Z term
<div></div> Identifiability	df = 546	df > 0
<div></div> Bootstrap Design	BTW	Nonparam.
<div></div> CI Method	BCa	BCa/Percentile
<div></div> Bootstrap B	B = 500	≥ 1,000
<div></div> Bootstrap Convergence	100%	≥ 95%
<div></div> Direct Effects	Est + BCa CI	Est + CI
<div></div> Indirect Effects	BCa CI	Boot CI
<div></div> Conditional Indirects	±1 SD levels	Low/Mid/High
<div></div> 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.