Table 2k
Summary of CHC cognitive-math reasoning studies : 9 to 13 years

Study [a]	Sample or subsample	*g*	Brd Math	Gs	P	RE/R4	AC/EF	Gsm	MW	MS	Gv	SR/Vz	MV	CS	SS	Ga	PC	US/UR	Glr	MA	NA	MM	M6	Gf	I	RG	RQ	Gc	LD/VL	K0	LS	VL
General, broad and narrow CHC abiliites included in studies [b]																																
Manifest variables-no *g*																																
2. McGrew & Hessler (1995)	b. 9-13 yrs [c]				X					O	O						O			O				X				X			
4. Floyd et al. (2003)	b. 9-13 yrs [d]			X				X	X		O					O			O					X				X			
5. McGrew (2007)	c. 9-13 yrs [e]				X	O	O		X	O		O	O	O	O		X	O		O	O	O			O	O	X	X	O	X	O
	d. 9-13 yrs [f]				X	O	O		X	O		O	O	O	O		X	X		O	O	O			O	X	X	O	X	X	O
8. Proctor et al. (2005)	6-18 yrs [d]			O							O					O			O				X				X			
10. Hale et al. (2008)	a. 6-17 yrs [g]			O					X		X												O	X				X			
	b. 6-17 yrs [g]			O					X		X												O	X				X			
	#s / #t			1/4	**3/3**	0/2	0/2	**1/1**	**5/5**	0/3	2/5	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	**2/3**	**1/2**	0/2	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/2	**5/5**	0/2	**0/1**	**2/2**	**6/7**	**1/2**	**2/2**	0/2
Latent variables- *g* included																																
11. McGrew et al. (1997)	b. 3-4th gr [c]	X	X		O					O	O						O			O				X				X			
	c. 5-6th gr [c]	X	X		X					O	O						O			O				O				X			
12. Keith (1999)	b. 5-8th gr [c]	X	X		O					O							O							X				O			
16. Taub et al. (2008)	c. 9-13 yrs [h]	X		X				O			O					O			O				X				X			
17. McGrew (2008) [i]	a. 3-5th [d]	X		X				O			O					O			O				O				O			
	b. 3-5th [d]	X		X				O			O					O			O				X				O			
19. Benson & Moseley (2009) [j]	c. 9-13 yrs [d]	X		X				O			O					O			O				X				X			
	#s / #t	**7/7**	**3/3**	**4/4**	1/3			0/4		0/3	0/6					0/4	0/3		0/4	0/2				**5/7**				**4/7**			
	Grand #s / #t	**7/7**	**3/3**	**5/8**	**4/6**	0/2	0/2	1/5	**5/5**	0/6	2/11	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/6	2/6	**1/2**	0/6	0/5	0/2	0/2	0/2	**10/12**	0/2	0/1	**2/2**	**10/14**	**1/2**	**2/2**	0/2

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 Applied Problems test or LV defined by Applied Problems test.

[d] DV was WJ III Math Reasoning (MR) cluster or LV defined by the WJIII tests (Applied Problems; Quantitative Concepts) that comprise the MR cluster.

[e] DV was WJ-III Applied Problems test. [f] DV was WJ III Quantitative Concepts test.

[g] DV was WIAT-II Math Reasoning test.

[h] DV was a Broad Math (BM) LV defined by WJ III Applied Problems (MR) and Applied Problems (MR) tests. Thus, Taub et al. (2008) is included in both the BMS and MR summary tables.

[i] 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)

[J] Benson (2009) g+broad "information processing model" included a linquistic/language comprehension LV (C = Comprehension) defined by the WJ III Understanding Directions, Story Recall, Passage Comprehension and Reading Vocabulary tests. This Comprehension LV is not included in the summary table although any indirect effects for other broad CHC LV's mediated by this LV are included for the respective CHC broad LV.