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Purpose of the Session

• Describe how meta-analysis and structural equation modeling can be combined and used to test the manner in which different structural and process intervention variables are directly and indirectly related to child, parent, or family outcomes

• Illustrate how meta-analytic structural equation modeling can identify pathways of influence between intervention and outcome variables as well as variables that mediate the relationships between the interventions and the outcomes
A Brief Description and Examples of:

- Meta-Analysis
- Structural Equation Modeling
Meta-Analysis

A procedure for combining (integrating) findings from different studies investigating the same or similar intervention (independent) variables and the same or similar outcome (dependent) variables to determine the average strength of the relationships between the two sets of variables. The weighted average size of effect for the relationships provide a more precise estimate of the effect of an intervention variable on an outcome variable.
Effect Sizes

Effect sizes rather than statistical significance are used to determine the strength of the relationships between independent and dependent variables in a meta-analysis. An effect size is a way of quantifying the differences between groups or the relationship between two variables. It is common practice to use standardized effect sizes because they mean the same thing for different studies.

Two Families of Effect Sizesª

- **Contrast Effect Sizes (e.g., Cohen’s d)**
  These effect sizes are used to determine the differences between two groups on an outcome measure where the two groups had different experiences (e.g., intervention group vs. control group).

- **Correlation Effect Sizes (e.g., Pearson Product Moment Correlation)**
  These effect sizes are used to determine the strength of the relationship between two variables for the same group of individuals (e.g., the relationship between frequency of an intervention and amount of child progress).

## Relationship Between Cohen’s $d$ and Correlation Coefficient Effect Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of a Meta-Analysis Using Contrasts Effect Sizes
Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Four Adult Learning Methods and Strategiesª

Carl J. Dunst     Carol M. Trivette     Deborah W. Hamby

**Adult Learning Methods:** Accelerated learning, coaching, guided design, just-in-time training

**Studies:** 58 randomized controlled design studies (N=2,095 experimental and 2,213 control group participants)

**Coding:** Six characteristics and associated practices of the adult learning methods were coded (instructor introduction and illustration of new knowledge or practice, and learning application, evaluation, reflection, and self-assessment of mastery of the knowledge or practice) and related to the study outcomes

**Outcomes:** Learner knowledge, skills, attitudes, and self-efficacy beliefs

**Measure of Effect Size:** Weighted average Cohen’s *d* effect sizes for between group post-test differences

## Cohen’s $d$ Effect Sizes for the Different Adult Learning Method Characteristics and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/Practices</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Effect Size</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of class activities/self instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.52-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/workshop lectures</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.53-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-class exercises</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.38-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustration/Demonstration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing/simulations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.42-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner input</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real life example/real life + role playing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.14-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real life application</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.79-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real life application + role playing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving tasks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess strengths/weaknesses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.65-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review experience/make changes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.38-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.89-1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journaling/behavior suggestion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.52-1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion about feedback</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mastery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards-based assessment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.72-.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self assessment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39-.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p. <01. ** p <.0001.
Example of a Meta-Analysis of Correlation Effect Sizes
Meta-Analysis of Family-Centered Help-giving Practices Researchª
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**Family-Centered Practices:** Relational and participatory help-giving practices measured by 12 different family-centered practices scales

**Studies:** 47 studies conducted in 7 countries (N=11,187 study participants)

**Outcomes:** Parent satisfaction, self-efficacy beliefs, social support, child behavior functioning, parent and family well-being, and parenting competence and confidence

**Measure of Effect Size:** Weighted average correlation coefficients for the relationships between relational and participatory family-centered practices and the study outcomes

## Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Relational and Participatory Practices and the Outcomes Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Relational Helpgiving Practices</th>
<th></th>
<th>Participatory Helpgiving Practices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Effect Sizeª</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Effect Sizeª</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Mean 95% CI</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Participant Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Staff</td>
<td>601 4</td>
<td>.67**** .63-.72</td>
<td>526 5</td>
<td>.38**** .34-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Program</td>
<td>1598 20</td>
<td>.63**** .62-.65</td>
<td>1598 8</td>
<td>.67**** .65-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Efficacy Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner Control</td>
<td>1368 10</td>
<td>.62**** .59-.65</td>
<td>1368 11</td>
<td>.62**** .59-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Control</td>
<td>754 10</td>
<td>.70**** .66-.73</td>
<td>754 13</td>
<td>.67**** .64-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Events Control</td>
<td>675 12</td>
<td>.32**** .26-.38</td>
<td>913 19</td>
<td>.39**** .35-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child Supports</td>
<td>181 4</td>
<td>.26**** .17-.36</td>
<td>181 4</td>
<td>.37**** .28-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Helpfulness</td>
<td>252 2</td>
<td>.47**** .37-.56</td>
<td>252 2</td>
<td>.52**** .43-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Child Behavior</td>
<td>345 8</td>
<td>.25**** .19-.31</td>
<td>345 5</td>
<td>.34**** .27-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Child Behavior</td>
<td>93 8</td>
<td>.25**** .18-.31</td>
<td>93 4</td>
<td>.20**** .11-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Competence</td>
<td>252 3</td>
<td>.24**** .14-.34</td>
<td>252 3</td>
<td>.18*** .08-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well-Being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Well-Being</td>
<td>1543 26</td>
<td>.27**** .25-.30</td>
<td>1543 16</td>
<td>.26**** .22-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Well-Being</td>
<td>245 4</td>
<td>.18**** .11-.27</td>
<td>245 4</td>
<td>.29**** .23-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>331 3</td>
<td>.16** .06-.27</td>
<td>331 4</td>
<td>.26**** .18-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>236 2</td>
<td>.05 -.07-.18</td>
<td>236 3</td>
<td>.11* .01-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>331 3</td>
<td>.15** .05-.26</td>
<td>331 4</td>
<td>.24**** .16-.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. ****p < .0001.
Structural Equation Modeling

A procedure for evaluating how a set of variables are related to one another in terms of causes and effects (i.e., pathways of influence). Structural equation modeling tests the fit of a proposed or hypothesized model to the pattern of relationships (e.g., correlations) among the variables in the model. Path diagrams are used to show how the variables in a model “go together.” How well the model fits the data is assessed by fit indices which tell us whether the model is accepted or rejected.

Two of the many fit indices are:

- Comparative fit index (The closer the fit index is to 1.0, the better is the fit of the model to the data)
- Root mean square error of approximation (The closer the fit index is to zero, the better is the fit of the model to the data)
A Simple Example of Structural Equation Modeling
Parent and Community Assets as Sources of Young Children’s Learning Opportunities

Carl J. Dunst

**Participants**: 100 low income mothers and their preschool age child(ren) in five public housing neighborhoods

**Intervention**: Number and frequency of child and parent-child participatory learning opportunities used by the mothers

**Outcomes**: Child engagement and positive affect and parent confidence and enjoyment in providing her child(ren) informal everyday family and community learning opportunities

**Predictions**: Parents who successfully engaged their children in the learning activities would have positive outcomes on both the children and parents where the relationship between the participatory learning opportunities and parent outcomes was mediated by child benefits

---

Path Diagram for the Relationships Among the Measures in the Model

Participatory Learning Opportunities → Child Outcomes → Parent Outcomes
Structural Equation Modeling Results

Effects Decomposition
- Direct = .13
- Indirect = .53
- Total = .66

Comparative Fit Index = .97

* $p < .06$. ** $p < .0001$. 
A More Complex Example of Structural Equation Modeling
Participants: 250 parents and their young children with disabilities or developmental delays involved in 59 different early childhood intervention programs in the same State.

Intervention: Effects of structural (e.g., length of program involvement) and process (family-centered practices) early intervention variables on parent and family well-being mediated by self-efficacy beliefs.

Hypothesis: (1) Family-centered practices would be indirectly related to parent well-being mediated by self-efficacy beliefs. (2) Program-related self-efficacy beliefs would be indirectly related to parent well-being mediated by personal belief appraisals. (3) Hours of parent contact would be indirectly related to program control appraisals mediated by family-centered practices.
Path Diagram for the Relationships Among the Measures in the Model
Structural Equation Modeling Results
Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling

Meta-analytic structural equation modeling is a procedure for combining data (e.g., correlations) from multiple studies (meta-analysis) and using the combined data set to evaluate the fit of a model to the patterns of relationships among the variables in the model by structural equation modeling. Recent advances in data analysis procedures make meta-analytic structural equation modeling potentially useful for evaluating the effects of different kinds of intervention practices on outcomes of interest. Dr. Mike Cheung at the National University of Singapore has developed software\(^a\) to prepare and analyze data to perform a MASEM.

Two-Stage Structural Equation Modelingª

**Stage 1.** Test the homogeneity of a pooled correlation matrix and produce a weighted pooled correlation matrix. This involves two steps:

1A. Testing the homogeneity of a pooled matrix
1B. Producing a weighted correlation matrix if the pooled matrix is homogeneous

**Stage 2.** Testing the fit of a hypothesized model to the patterns of relationships among the variables in the pooled matrix using SEM. Two types of statistics are used to evaluate fit:

2A. Testing the fit of a model to the patterns of correlations among the variables in the model
2B. Estimate the strength of the relationships between the variables in a model

### Stage 1A: Pooling Correlation Matrices

The pooled correlation matrix is first evaluated to determine if the correlations among the measures in different studies are homogeneous. The procedure is analogous to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The CFA is evaluated by the same fit indices (e.g., RMSEA, CFI) used to test the fit of a model to the data in an SEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Pooled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable 1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 2</td>
<td>.62 .1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49 .1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55 .1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55 .1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 3</td>
<td>.33 .51 1.0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.42 .49 1.0</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>.37 .50 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable 4</td>
<td>.41 .32 .38 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45 .23 -1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33 .30 .36 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40 .28 .34 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 1B: Produce a Weighted Pooled Correlation Matrix

A weighted pooled correlation matrix adjusts the size of the correlations between variables by giving more weight to studies with larger sample sizes.

- If the correlations for large N studies are smaller than those for small N studies, the pooled correlation will be smaller than the weighted average correlation.
- If the correlations for large N studies are larger than those for small N studies, the pooled correlation will be larger than the weighted average correlation.
Stage 2A: Testing Model Fit

Model fit is a procedure used to assess “how well” the hypothesized model fits the hypothesized relationships between the variables in a pooled correlation matrix. This is equivalent to performing an SEM on the pooled correlation matrix. Different fit indices are available for weighted test. Two of the recommended fit indices for two-stage meta-analytic structural equation modeling are:

- Comparative fit index
- Root mean square error of approximation
Stage 2B: Sizes of Effects in the Structural Equation Model

This step produces the effect sizes (parameter estimates) for each of the paths in a model. You can use either standardized or nonstandardized path coefficients as the sizes of effect. Standardized effect sizes can range between -1 and +1. We prefer standardized coefficients for several reasons:

- Measures of the same construct are generally not scaled the same in the different primary studies
- All effect sizes can be interpreted in the same manner
A Simple Example of a Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling Analysis
Influences of Family-Centered Help-Giving on Parenting Confidence, Competence and Enjoyment

**Studies:** Eight studies that all included measures of family-centered practices, parent self-efficacy beliefs, and parenting confidence, competence and enjoyment.

**Sample:** N = 934 participants.

**Family-Centered Practices Measures:** Family-Centered Practices Scale, Enabling Practices Scale

**Self-Efficacy Beliefs:** Control appraisals of the ability to obtain the information and guidance, and supports and resources, from early intervention program staff

**Parenting Capabilities:** Everyday Parenting Scale (confidence, competence, enjoyment)

**Hypothesis:** Family-centered practices would be indirectly related to parenting confidence, competence and enjoyment mediated by self-efficacy beliefs
Stacked Correlation Matrices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>ENJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational (REL)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory (PAR)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy (SEB)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence (CON)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence (COM)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment (ENJ)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studies
Model for Testing the Direct and Indirect Effects of Family-Centered Practices or Parenting Behavior
Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling Results

Fit Indices
RMSEA = .05
CFI = 1.00

Effects Decomposition
Direct = .00
Indirect = .20
Total = .20

* p < .0001.
Multi-Variable Complex Model Examples


- Influences of child nursery rhyme knowledge on phonological awareness and later reading abilities (in preparation).

- Meta-analytic structural equation modeling of family capacity-building early intervention practices on parent, parent-child, and child outcomes (study in progress).
Studies: 15 investigations of family-centered care that included measures of family-centered practices, self-efficacy beliefs, parent psychological health, and child psychological health.

Sample: N= 2948 parents and their young children with disabilities or medical conditions involved in different early intervention, health care, and hospital programs.

Family-Centered Care Measures: Help-Giving Practices Scale, Family-Centered Practices Scale, and Enabling Practices Scale

Hypothesis: Based on contentions in the family-centered care literature, family-centered practices were expected to directly affect parent psychological health and parent health in turn affect child psychological health. Based on our own research, the relationships between family-centered care and parent and child health were expected to be mediated by self-efficacy beliefs.

---

Structural Equation Model for Evaluating the Effects of Family-Centered Care, Self-Efficacy Beliefs, and Child Special Health Care Needs Status on Parent and Child Psychological Health
Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling Results

Fit Indices
RMSEA = .04
CFI = 1.00

*p < .01, **p < .001, ***p < .0001.
Influences of Family-Systems Intervention Practices on Parent-Child Interactions and Child Developmentª

Carol M. Trivette    Carl J. Dunst    Deborah W. Hamby

**Studies:** Eight studies that included measures allowing us to trace the effects of capacity-building help-giving practices and family-systems intervention practices on parent-child interactions and child development

**Sample:** 910 preschoolers and their parents involved in different kinds of help-giving programs

**Predictions:** The influences of help-giving and family-systems intervention practices on parent-child interactions and child development would be indirect and mediated by self-efficacy beliefs and parent well-being

ª Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 2010, 30, 3-19.
Family-Systems Intervention Model

- Capacity-Building Help-Giving Practices
  - Family Concerns And Priorities
  - Family Strengths
  - Supports and Resources

---

Model for Assessing the Direct and Indirect Effects of Different Predictor Variables on Parent-Child Interactions and Child Development

- Capacity-Building Help-Giving Practices
- Family-Systems Intervention Practices
- Self-Efficacy Beliefs
- Parent/Family Characteristics
- Parent Well-Being
- Parent-Child Interactions
- Child Disability
- Child Development
Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling Results

Fit Indices
RMSEA = .06
CFI = .96

* p < .05. **p < .01. *** p < .001. **** p < .0001.
Influences of Child Nursery Rhyme Knowledge on Phonological Awareness and Later Reading Abilities

Carl J. Dunst

Studies: 15 studies (identified so far) that have assessed preschoolers nursery rhyme knowledge or awareness and its relationship to phonological awareness and later reading abilities

Sample: 350 (so far)

Measures: Home experiences, child nursery rhyme knowledge, child phonological awareness (rhyme detection, phoneme detection), parent education, child IQ, and child reading, vocabulary, expressive language, and receptive language (among other measures)

Hypotheses: Parent mediated home literacy experiences would be related to children’s nursery rhyme knowledge where nursery rhyme knowledge would be indirectly reading to emergent reading mediated by phonological awareness

---

a In preparation.
Model for Evaluating the Determinants and Consequences of Nursery Rhyme Knowledgeª

ª Based on research conducted by Peter Bryant, Lynette Bradley, and colleagues at the University of Oxford.
Studies: More than 75 studies of parents and their infants and toddlers with disabilities or developmental delays.

Sample: The final sample size for the MASEM is expected to include more than 10,000 parents and children.

Hypotheses: (1) Early intervention provided in a family-centered manner will have more positive effects on parent outcomes. (2) Family-centered practices will be indirectly related to parent well-being and parent-child outcomes mediated by self-efficacy beliefs. (3) Parenting self-efficacy beliefs will be directly related to parent-child interactions and indirectly related to child outcomes mediated by parent well-being.

—institute for education sciences development grant (study in progress).
Model for Evaluating the Influences of Process and Structural Early Intervention of Parent, Parent-Child, and Child Outcomes

- **Process Early Intervention Variables**
  - Parent Self-Efficacy Beliefs
    - Parent Well-Being
    - Parent-Child Interactions
    - Child Outcomes

- **Structural Early Intervention Variables**
Variables Included in the Model and Analyses

- Parent/Family Background Variables
- Child Background Variables
- Early Intervention Structural Variables
- Early Intervention Process Variables
- Parent Self-Efficacy Beliefs
- Parent Stress and Well-Being
- Parent-Child Interactions
- Child Behavioral Outcomes
- Child Developmental Outcomes
Parent, Family, and Child Variables

*Parent Variables*
- Parent age, parent education level

*Family Variables*
- Family socioeconomic status, family income

*Child Variables*
- Child disability, child severity of delay
Early Intervention Variables

Structural Variables

- Child age at the start of intervention, length of intervention
- Type of child services (special instruction/education, speech and language pathology, occupational therapy, physical therapy)
- Hours of intervention, frequency of intervention, intensity of services
- Length of parent involvement, frequency of contact with early intervention staff

Process Variables

- Family-centered practices, working alliance, relational help giving practices, participatory help giving practices
Parent-Related Measures

*Self-Efficacy Beliefs*
- Program-related parent control appraisals, parenting self-efficacy beliefs, general life events belief appraisals

*Parent Well-Being*
- Parent stress, parent psychological health, parent positive and negative affect

*Parenting Interactional Styles*
- Parent sensitivity, parent responsiveness, parent directiveness
Child Outcome Variables

*Child Behavioral Measures*
- Cognitive style, social-emotional behavior, positive affect, negative affect, interactional style, social responsiveness

*Child Developmental Measures*
- Cognitive, language, social, motor, and adaptive functioning
Major Types of Planned Analyses

• Direct effects of the process and structural early intervention variables on the parent measures (self-efficacy beliefs, well-being, parent-child interaction)

• Indirect effects of the process early intervention measures on the parent measures mediated by the structural early intervention measures

• The mediated relationships among variables in the SEM model to identify pathways of influence

• The moderating effects of parent, family, and child background variables on the relationships between the other variables in the model
Direct Effects of Early Intervention on the Parent and Parent-Child Outcomes

- Early intervention can be assessed as either or both measured and latent variables
- Any of the other constructs in the model can also be assessed as either measured or latent variables including the child behavioral and developmental outcomes
Indirect Effects of Early Intervention on the Study Outcomes

- Indirect or mediated effects are estimated from the products of two or more direct effects
- The indirect effect of process early intervention variables on parent well-being, for example, are determined from the product of $\beta_1 \times \beta_2$. 
Moderators of the Relationships Between Early Intervention and the Study Outcomes

- Moderator analyses “test us” if the relationships between any two variables in the model are different at different levels of moderator variables (e.g., low SES vs. high SES)
- These types of analyses can help identify the conditions under which process and structural early intervention variables have similar or different consequences
Pathways of Influence of Early Intervention on the Parent, Parent-Child, and Child Outcome Measures

- Effects decomposition is used to identify the pathways of influence of the different early intervention variables on child outcomes.
- This data analysis strategy allows one to determine the direct, indirect, and total effect of any one variable in the model on any other variable in the model.
Conclusions

- Meta-analytic structural equation modeling is useful for evaluating the direct and indirect effects of different kinds of intervention practices on outcomes of interest.

- One could include any number measured and latent intervention variables in a MASEM model and evaluate their effects on outcomes mediated by other variables (e.g., self-efficacy beliefs).

- There are many different kinds of early childhood intervention studies that can be examined to determine the pathways of influence of different kinds of intervention practices on child, parent-child, and child outcomes.