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
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

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 = 2000**	≥ 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