Table 2b Summary of CHC cognitive-basic reading skills studies: 9-13 years

General, broad and narrow CHC abiliites included in studies b

	Sample or	g	Brd	Gs				Gsm			Gv					Ga			Glr				Gf				Gc			
Study ^a	subsample		Rdg		Р	RE/R4	AC/EF		MW	MS		SR/Vz	MV	CS	SS		PC	US/UR		MA	NA	MM			RG	RQ	LD/VL	K0	LS	VL
Manifest variables-no g																														
1. McGrew (1993)	b. 9-13 yrs ^c				Χ					Х	0						Х			0			0				Х			
3. Evans et al. (2002)	b. 9-13 yrs ^c			Х				Х	Χ		0					0	Χ		0				0				Х			
5. McGrew (2007)	c. 9-13 yrs ^d				Χ	0	0		X	X	0	0	0	0	0		X	X		0	0	0		0	0	0	Χ	X	0	0
	d. 9-13 yrs ^e				Χ	0	0		Χ	Х	0	0	0	0	0		Χ	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	Х	0	0	0
6. Miller (2000)	11-14 yrs ^d			Х						X	0					0			0				0				Х			
7. Ganci (2004)	6-12 yrs ^h			0						0						Χ			0								Х			
	#s / #t			2/3	3/3	0/2	0/2	1/1	3/3	4/5	0/5	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	1/3	4/4	1/2	0/3	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/2	6/6	1/2	0/2	0/2
Latent variables- g included																														
12. Keith (1999)	b. 5-8th gr ^f	Х	Х		X					0							Χ						0				0			
14. Vanderwood et al. (2002)	c. 5-6th gr ^f	Х	X		0					0	0						Χ			0			0				0			
	d. 7-9th gr ^f	Х	Χ		0					0	0						Χ			0			0				0			
15. Floyd et al. (2007) ^g	e. 9-13 yrs ^c	Х		0				Х			0					0			0				0				Х			
	f. 9-13 yrs ^c	Х		0				Х	0	X	0					0	0	0	0	0	0		0				Х	Х	0	0
17. McGrew (2008) ¹	a. 3-5th gr ^c	Х		Х				Х			0					0				0			0				0			
	b. 3-5th gr c	Х		Х				Х			0					0				0			0				Χ			
18. Benson (2008)	b. 4-6th gr ^c	Х		0				0			0					0	0		0		0		0				0			
	#s / #t	8/8	3/3	2/5	1/3		•	4/5	0/1	1/4	0/7			•		0/5	3/5	0/1	0/3	0/5	0/2		0/8				3/8	1/1	0/1	0/1
	Grand #s / #t	8/8	3/3	4/8	4/6	0/3	0/3	5/6	3/4	5/9	0/12	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	1/8	7/9	1/3	0/6	0/8	0/4	0/2	0/11	0/2	0/2	0/2	9/14	2/3	0/3	0/3

Note. X = significant effect/relation reported; O = no significant effect/relation reported for cognitive ability that was included as an IV. Blank space indicates that cognitive ability was not included as an IV.

Note. #s / #t = # times cognitive ability was significant / total # of times cognitive ability was included in analysis. 50+% in bold font.

^a See Table 1 for summary of study characteristics.

^b See Newton & McGrew (2009) for definitions of broad and narrow CHC abilities.

^c DV was WJ-R or WJ III Basic Reading Skills (BRS) cluster or LV defined by the WJ-R/WJ III tests (Letter-Word Identification; Word Attack) that comprise the BRS cluster.

^d DV was WJ-R or WJ-III Letter-Word Identification test. ^e DV was WJ III Word Attack test.

fWJ-R/WJ III Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack tests represented separate DV (LVs) in a single SEM model. Significance (X) recorded for a cognitive ability if it was significantly associated with either test (or both).

⁹ Floyd et al. (2007) samples e/f are based on the same sample but SEM models included different number of LVs at different strata. Sample "e" evaluated g+broadmodels. Sample "f"evaluated g+broad+narrow models.

^h DV as classification of subjects as reading disabled (RD) or non-reading disabled (NRD) in basic reading skills, reading comprehension, or both. Thus, Ganci (2004) is included in both the BRS and RC summary tables.

¹ McGrew (2008) samples a/b are based on the same subjects analyzed by SEM models that treated g as direct+indirect effect (a) or indirect effect only (b)