

# 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
$\chi^2$	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 = 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.