

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	891.85	Report
● df	523	Report
● p value	< .001	Report
● CFI	0.997	≥ 0.95
● TLI	0.996	≥ 0.95
● RMSEA	0.012	≤ 0.06
● SRMR	0.047	≤ 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.