# Introducing Meta-Analysis and *Meta-Stat*

This chapter introduces meta-analysis and the Meta-Stat program.

# Introducing Meta-Analysis

Research literature, it is often pointed out, is growing at an exponential rate. A recent study estimated that there are 40,000 journals for the sciences, and that researchers are filling those journals at the rate of one article every 30 seconds, 24 hours a day, seven days a week (Mahoney, 1985). No matter what the topic—from computer-aided instruction to sex differences to the effects of medication on hyperactivity—researchers can, in just a few years, add dozens and even hundreds of studies to the literature.

As research results accumulate, it becomes increasingly difficult to understand what they tell us. It becomes increasingly difficult to find the knowledge in this flood of information.

In 1976, Gene Glass proposed a method to integrate and summarize the findings from a body of research. He called the method **meta-analysis**. Meta-analysis is the statistical analysis of a collection of individual studies.

Meta-analysis refers to the analysis of analyses. I use it to refer to the statistical analysis of a large collection of results from individual studies for the purpose of integrating the findings. It connotes a rigorous alternative to the casual, narrative discussions of research studies which typify our attempts to make sense of the rapidly expanding research literature. (Glass, 1976)

#### The Traditional Approach to Research Integration

Using the traditional method of integrating research studies, a reviewer provides a narrative, chronological discourse on previous findings. Yet this method is flawed and inexact:

- ! Unable to deal with the large number of studies on a topic, reviewers focus on a small subset of studies, often without describing how the subset was selected.
- ! Reviewers often cite the conclusions of previous reviews without examining those reviews critically.
- ! Reviewers are usually active and prominent in the field under review. Therefore, they might not be inclined to give full weight to evidence that is contrary to their own positions.

#### The Meta-Analysis Approach to Research Integration

In a meta-analysis, research studies are collected, coded, and interpreted using statistical methods similar to those used in primary data analysis. The result is an integrated review of findings that is more objective and exact than a narrative review.

#### Solving the Complexity Problem

The human mind is not equipped to consider simultaneously a large number of alternatives. (This is true even for bright, energetic researchers.) Confronted with the results of 20 similar studies, the mind copes only with great difficulty. Confronted with 200, the mind reels. Yet that is exactly the scope of the problem faced by a researcher attempting to integrate the results from a large number of studies. As a result,

The typical review concludes that the research is in horrible shape; sometimes one gets results, sometimes one doesn't. Then the call is sounded for better research designs, better measures, better statistical methods—in short, a plaintive wish that things were not so complicated as they are. (Glass, 1976)

When performed on a computer, meta-analysis helps the reviewer surmount the complexity problem. The reviewer can code hundreds of studies into a data set.

The data set can then be manipulated, measured, and displayed by the computer in a variety of ways.

#### Solving the Ambiguity Problem

Researchers can tolerate ambiguity well. Policy makers, however, particularly elected policy makers, have a limited time in which to act. They look to research to provide information that will help them choose among policy options.

Unfortunately, original research, and narrative reviews of the research, often do not provide clear options to policy makers. Senator Walter Mondale expressed his frustration to the American Psychological Association in 1970:

What I have not learned is what we should do about these [educational] problems.... For every study, statistical or theoretical, that contains a proposed solution or recommendation, there is always another equally well-documented study, challenging the assumptions or conclusions of the first. No one seems to agree with anyone else's approach. But more distressing: no one seems to know what works.

#### Solving the Replication Problem

A scientific study should be designed and reported in such a way that it can be replicated by other researchers. However, researchers seldom attempt to replicate previous findings. Instead, they pursue funding for the new, the novel, or—at the very least—they attempt to extend what is considered to be the current state of knowledge in their field. The result can be an overwhelming number of studies on a given topic, with no two studies exactly alike.

In such circumstances, it is difficult to determine if the differences between the study outcomes are due to chance, to inadequate study methods, or to systematic differences in the characteristics of the studies.

Meta-analysis can help you investigate the relationship between study features and study outcomes. You code the study features according to the objectives of the review. You transform the study outcomes to a common metric so that you can compare the outcomes. Last, you use statistical methods to show the relationships between study features and outcomes.

## Introducing Meta-Stat

*Meta-Stat* is a computer program that automates the many complex tasks that are required to perform a meta-analysis. With *Meta-Stat*, you can:

! Code the features of each study

- ! Transform study findings into a common metric, called the **effect size**, so that the studies can be compared
- ! Apply statistical techniques to the data
- ! Display the data on a variety of charts

The following sections provide an overview of *Meta-Stat*.

#### **Coding Study Features**

One of your first tasks will be to create variables with which you can code study features. *Meta-Stat* offers 10 variables as a starting point, including:

- ! Effect size
- ! Unbiased effect size
- ! Sample size

You can create your own variables to identify features of the studies. For example, suppose you are reviewing studies that investigate the effects of pre-test coaching on Scholastic Aptitude Test scores. You would probably need to create a variable

to identify the number of hours of coaching:



You can also create variables to track the characteristics of the studies in your meta-analysis. For example, suppose you want to analyze the relationship between study outcomes and study quality. You can create a variable to identify the quality of each study. In this example, the variable can identify up to three levels of quality:



After creating the variables you need, you use the variables to code the features of each study. The following example shows the entry screen you use to enter data about each study:



#### **Transforming Study Results into Effect Sizes**

In addition to coding the features of each study, you must also code the results. Because results can be reported in different ways in different studies, *Meta-Stat* allows you to enter the outcome statistics as reported in the original studies.

*Meta-Stat* transforms the outcome statistic into the **effect size**. The effect size is the standardized difference between the means of the treatment group and the control group or between the means of two treatment groups. You can read more about the effect size in Chapter 6.

Some study results are more properly described with correlational coefficients, differences between percents, or even odds ratios. *Meta-Stat* can also analyze correlations and has routines for correct for several attenuating factors. The plain statistics option can be used for analyzing other types of data.

In the following example, *Meta-Stat* will calculate the effect size from the F statistic reported in the original study.



## **Applying Statistical Techniques to Your Data**

After you enter the coded study features, *Meta-Stat* can help you uncover the secrets in your data by applying a full set of statistical techniques.

You can display simple descriptive statistics. This example shows descriptive statistics for the Effect Size variable from a particular meta-analysis:

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS   Criterion Variable:   Veighting Variable:   Select If:   Number of Valid Observations:   Number of Valid Observations:   1   unweighted   Mean   Nedian   Uariance   0.376   Stand. Dev.   Max Value   2.087   Range   2.374	iet <del>a</del> -stat		<b>09/10/9</b> 3
Criterion Variable: UNBIASED Unbiased Effect Size Weighting Variable: Select If: Number of Valid Observations: 29 Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Mean 0.591 Natian 0.479 Variance 0.376 Stand. Dev. 0.613 Min Value -0.287 Max Value 2.087 Range 2.374 Hedges's Ht 116.965 (p = 0.000)		- DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	
Number of Valid Observations: 29 Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Mean 0.591 Median 0.479 Uariance 0.376 Stand. Dev. 0.613 Min Value -0.287 Max Value 2.087 Nange 2.374 Hedges's Ht 115.965 (p = 0.000)	Criterion Variable: Veighting Variable: Select If:	UNBIASED Unbiased Effect Size	
Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Median 0.591 Median 0.479 Uariance 0.376 Stand. Dev. 0.613 Min Ualue =0.287 Max Ualue 2.087 Range 2.374 Hedges's Ht 115.965 (p = 0.000)	Number of Valid Obse	ruations: 29	
unweighted Mean 0.591 Median 0.479 Variance 0.376 Stand. Dev. 0.613 Min Value -0.287 Max Value 2.087 Range 2.374 Hedges's Ht 115.965 (p = 0.000)	Number of Missing Ot	servations: 1	
Mean 0.591   Median 0.479   Uariance 0.376   Stand. Dev. 0.613   Min Ualue -0.287   Max Ualue 2.067   Range 2.374   Hedges's Ht 116.965 (p = 0.000)		unve ighted	
Median 0.479   Uariance 0.376   Stand. Dev. 0.613   Min Ualue =0.287   Max Ualue 2.067   Range 2.374   Hedges's Ht 116.965 (p = 0.999)	Mean	0.591	
Uariance 0.376   Stand. Dev. 0.613   Min Ualue =0.287   Max Ualue 2.087   Range 2.374   Hedges's Ht 116.965 (p = 0.000)	Median	0.479	
Stand. Dev. 0.613   Min Ualue =0.287   Max Ualue 2.087   Range 2.374   Hedges's Ht 115.965 (p = 0.000)	Variance	0.376	
Min Ualue =0.287 Max Ualue 2.087 Range 2.374 Hedges's Ht 115.965 (p = 0.000)	Stand. Dev.	0.613	
Max Ualue 2.087 Range 2.374 Hedges's Ht 116.965 (p = 0.000)	Min Value	-9.267	
Range 2.374 Hedges's Ht 116.965 (p = 0.000)	Max Value	2.087	
Hedges's Ht	Range	2.374	
	Hedges's Ht	116.965 (p = 0.000)	
trl=P Print F10 Menu 1J mext variable PgDn more 22:14:	trl=P Print F10 Menu †J	l next variable FgDn more	ZZ:14:26

You can obtain a host of statistics that are described in the meta-analysis literature as show on the following screen:

Criterion Variable: UNBIASED Unbiased Effect Size Weighting Variable: Select If: Number of Valid Observations: 29 Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Mean ES Fisher's Z Equiv ES Equiv ES Equiv R Equiv R SQ Failsafe N Var Ratio DESCRIPTIVE SIRIISTICS Unbiased Effect Size 29 0.591 1.497 (p=0.13) 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.579 0.3.750	eta-stat		09/10/93
Criterion Variable: UNBIASED Unbiased Effect Size Veighting Variable: Select If: Number of Valid Observations: 29 Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Mean ES 0.591 Fisher's Z 1.497 (p=0.13) Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv R SQ 0.677 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.750			
Number of Valid Observations: 29 Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Mean ES 0.591 Fisher's Z 1.497 (p=0.13) Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv R 0.278 Equiv R 0.278 Equiv R SQ 0.677 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.759	Criterion Variable: Weighting Variable: Select If:	UNBIASED Unbiased Effect Size	
Number of Missing Observations: 1 unweighted Mean ES 0.591 Fisher's Z 1.497 (p=0.13) Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv R 0.278 Equiv R SQ 0.077 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.750	Number of Valid Obse	rvations: 29	
unveighted Nean ES 0.591 Fisher's Z 1.497 (p=0.13) Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv R 0.278 Equiv R SQ 0.677 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.750	Number of Missing Ob	servations: 1	
Mean ES   0.591     Fisher's Z   1.497 (p=0.13)     Equiv ES   0.579     Equiv R   0.278     Equiv R SQ   0.077     Failsafe N   0     Var Ratio   3.750		unve ighted	
Fisher's Z 1.497 (p=0.13) Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv R 0.278 Equiv R SQ 0.077 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.750	Mean ES	0.591	
Equiv ES 0.579 Equiv R 0.278 Equiv R SQ 0.677 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.750	Fisher's Z	1.497 (p≡0.13)	
Equiv R SQ 0.077 Failsafe N 0 Var Ratio 3.750	Equiv ES	0.575	
Failsaft N 9 Var Ratio 3.759	Equiv R SQ	9.077	
Var Ratio 3.759	Failsafe N	0	
l	Var Ratio	3.750	
	I		
trl=F Print F10 Menu 14 next variable FgUp basic 22:15:	trl=P Print F10 Menu †↓	next variable FgUp basic	22:15: <b>1</b> 2

Using Regression analysis, you can perform regression calculations using any predictor variables that you choose:

Meta-Stat					09/10/93
	REGI	ESSION —			<u> </u>
Criterion Variable: Predictor Variables:	une iasei Hours	Unbiased	Effect Size		
Weighted by: Listvise deletion Solution took 1 iterations	VEIGHT	Inverse	of the varian	CC	
Multiple R Adjusted R-Square	0.7706 0.5776	R S Sta	quar <del>c</del> ndard Error	0. <b>5939</b> 1.3637	
	DF	Sun of squares	Me squa	an re	P
Regression Residual	1 25	67.9878 Q 46.4942 Q	(R) 67.96 (E) 1.85	. <u></u> 1 <b>78</b> ( 1 <b>98</b> (	9. <b>000</b> 9.0001
Ctrl-P Print F10 Menu			PgDn Mar <del>c</del>		22:16:20

You can study the differences between groups. In the following example from the Group Means analysis, *Meta-Stat* has calculated the effect size mean, standard deviation, and 95 percent confidence intervals for a grouping variable called Publication Type. This variable identifies where a study was published:

eta-stat					<b>09/10/9</b> 3
Criterion Variable: UNBIASE	≕ GNUUF HLA D				
	Mean	St. Dev.	N	95% Confid	l Interval
PUBYRGRP Year of publication			_		
	1.146	0.413	2	0.671 to	1.620
2 71=75	0.532	0.534	5	-0.081 to	1.146
3 76-89	0.557	0.673	15	0.187 to	0.928
4 81+	0.097	0.260	4	-0.264 to	0.458
Source S Total Vithin	es's Homogen tatistic 116.965 97.591	nity Tests - 1f 28 (p = 0.( 25 (p = 0.(	 900 ) 900 )	]	
Between	19.373	3 (p = 0.0	900 )	]	
				<del>,</del>	
trl=P Print F10 Menu					22:19:4

You can also tell *Meta-Stat* to create dummy variables from a grouping variable. This allows you to explore the differences between the groups identified by that variable. The following example shows regression results for which dummy variables were created from the variable Publication Type. The results allow you to compare studies based on where the studies were published:

eta-stat						09/10/93
		REGRE	85 ION			<del></del>
Variable		Beta	B	St Err	t	P
PUBTY_GP	journa l	0.21Z	0.281	0.344	0.817	0.580
PUBTY_GP	dissert	0.307	0.451	0.351	1.285	0.197
PUBTY_GP	paper	0.206	0.325	0.355	0.914	0.636
PUBTY_GP	other	0.46Z	1.377	0. <b>426</b>	3.230	0.002
Constant			0.508	0.414	1.226	0.219
Standard	l errors fo	llov Hedge	s and Olki	n (1985, pa	ages 167—:	188).
Standard	l <b>errore</b> fo	llov Hedge	s and Olki	n (1985, pa	ages 167–:	188).

## **Displaying Results**

*Meta-Stat* can display your data on a variety of charts. For example, you can show the effect size and 95 percent confidence intervals for each study:



A wide range of graphic options are available.