D[illegible] C. B[illegible]
University of Colorado, Boulder

This article raises some questions about the usefulness of meta-analysis as a means of reviewing quantitative research in the social sciences. When a meta-analytic model for SAT coaching is used to predict results from future studies, the amount of prediction error is quite large. Interpretations of meta-analytic regressions and quantifications of program and study characteristics are shown to be equivocal. The match between the assumptions of the meta-analytic model and the data from SAT coaching studies is not good, making statistical inferences problematic. Researcher subjectivity is no less problematic in the context of a meta-analysis than in a narrative review.

Keywords: *meta-analysis; literature review; SAT coaching; statistical inference*

[illegible] *Meta-Analysis in Social Research* ([illegible] 1981) [illegible] *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis* ([illegible] 1985) [illegible] 1980 [illegible]. A [illegible] *meta-analysis* [illegible] C[illegible] ([illegible] C) [illegible] 1980 [illegible] 2003 [illegible] 1,000 [illegible] *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Generalized Causal Inference,* [illegible]

[illegible]: *The author thanks David Freedman and Lorrie Shepard for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.*

[illegible] . 29 [illegible] . 2, [illegible] 2005 87-127
D[illegible]: 10.1177/0193841[illegible]04272555

[illegible] 20 [illegible] ([illegible], C[illegible], [illegible] C[illegible] 2002, 446).

[illegible] ([illegible] 1986; [illegible] 1988; B[illegible] 2004; B[illegible] 2003). [illegible] ([illegible] 1990; [illegible] 1988). A[illegible]

[illegible] A[illegible] : ( ) [illegible] ( ) [illegible] B[illegible] A[illegible] (B[illegible] 2001, 2002 , 2004 , 2004), [illegible] A[illegible] A[illegible]

[illegible] A[illegible] B[illegible] B[illegible] 1990. [illegible] B[illegible]

TABLE 1: Observed and Predicted Effects From New Coaching Studies

			Predicted Coaching Effect From Bec e (1990)			
Re	*Study*	*Coaching Effect*	*Model A*	*Model B*	*Model C*	*Model D*
H e e (1984)	SAT-V	57	30	11.6	12.9	24.5
	SAT-M	37	30	25.5	1.2	35.8
F a e (1987)	SAT-V	16	30	11.6	1.9	0.8
	SAT-M	16	30	25.5	13.6	12.1
Ha e (1988)	SAT-M	21	30	25.5	14.5	8.1
W a (1988)	SAT-V	11	30	11.6	2.7	0.5
	SAT-M	16	30	25.5	14.4	11.8
S edec (1989)	SAT-V	0	30	11.6	2.7	0.2

TABLE 2: Average Prediction Error From Becker's (1990) Meta-Analytic Models

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (C[illegible]), [illegible] (C[illegible]), [illegible] (A[illegible] C[illegible]).[7] [illegible]

[illegible] D, [illegible] 21(3.43([illegible])- [illegible] D8([illegible] 1)-250 [illegible]

TABLE 4: Estimated Coaching Effects in Randomized Studies

Report and Study	*SAT-M*	*SAT-V*
Alderman and Powers (1980)		
School A		22
School B		9
School C		14
School D		14
School E		1
School F		14
School G		18
School H		1
Evans and Pike (1973)		
Group A	12	
Group B	25	
Group C	11	
Laschewer (1985)	8	0
Roberts and Oppenheim (1966)		
School A		17
School B	12	
Zuman (1988)	51	14
Median effect estimate	12	14

TABLE 5:

[illegible] 30 [illegible] 30 [illegible]

[illegible] A. [illegible] A [illegible] 10- [illegible] 4 [illegible] A [illegible] A [illegible] A [illegible] B. [illegible] 24 [illegible] C [illegible] C [illegible]

[illegible] C [illegible] C'. B [illegible] (1978). A [illegible] A [illegible] A [illegible] A [illegible] 55 [illegible] 40 [illegible] C [illegible]

[illegible] C'. B [illegible] (1979). [illegible] B [illegible] (1982). [illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible]

[illegible] 556 [illegible] 1,566 [illegible]

[illegible] (1990, 397). [illegible] 1982). [illegible]

Calculating effect sizes for meta-analytic regressions. [illegible]

[illegible] (1978) [illegible] 55 [illegible] (1979) [illegible] (1980) [illegible] 30 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 72 -63( )-63( )5(8( )-1.670.5(23 333

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (h),

[illegible]

[illegible] X [illegible] Y [illegible]

$$X^{C}_{hij} \sim N\left(\mu^{C}_{hi}, \sigma^{2}_{hi}\right) \text{ and } Y^{C}_{hij} \sim N\left(\nu^{C}_{hi}, \sigma^{2}_{hi}\right), \tag{4}$$

[illegible]

$$X^{U}_{hij} \sim N\left(\mu^{U}_{hi}, \sigma^{2}_{hi}\right) \text{ and } Y^{U}_{hij} \sim N\left(\nu^{U}_{hi}, \sigma^{2}_{hi}\right). \tag{5}$$

[illegible] σ^{2}_{hi} [illegible] $\mu^{C}_{hi}, \nu^{C}_{hi}, \mu_{hi}, \nu^{U}_{hi}$, [illegible] σ^{2}_{hi} [illegible] *population* [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (D[illegible] 1953; [illegible] 1955; D[illegible] 1958; [illegible] 1979; B[illegible] 1986;

[illegible] (A[illegible] 1980) [illegible] 1980 [illegible] 1961; [illegible] 1965; [illegible] 1973; [illegible] 1978; [illegible] 1980; [illegible] 1980).

[illegible]

[illegible], B [illegible] (2003) [illegible] 50% [illegible]

[illegible] (1978), [illegible] (1980), [illegible] (1981), [illegible] (1982), [illegible] (1989). [illegible] -251.93 [illegible]

TABLE 6: Studies by Coaching Mode and Design

	Me d ca De		
C ac T e	*Ra d ed C*	*Ob e a a C*	*N C*
Sc -ba ed	R be a d O e e (1966) E a a d P e (1973) A de a a d P e (1980) S a (1992)	D e (1953) F e c (1955) Dea (1958) Keefa e (1976) K c (1979) J (Sa F a c c e) (1984)[a] B e (1986) Re d a d Obe a (1987) Ha e (1988) W , C d , a d Ma e (1989) Sc ede (1992) W e (1996)	Pa e (1961) Ma (1965) J (A a a, Ne Y e) (1984)[a]

C e c a -ba ed		F a e (1960) W a (1962) Fede a T ade C d a d ea a e B Re a Off ce (1978) B ea f C e P ec (1979) R c (1980) S d (1980) Se , Be a d , a d K a (1982) F a e (1987) W a (1988) Z a (1988)[a] S edec (1989) S (1989) S (1990) P e a d R c (1999) B (2001)	Ka a (2002)
C e -ba ed	H e e (1984) La c e e (1985)		

- [illegible]
- [illegible]
- [illegible]

[illegible] (2000) [illegible]

[illegible] A. C[illegible] (1982, 108) [illegible]

, 1 -2001

Sa e S e^a (C ac ed/T a)

G ade *Yea ( )* *SES fb.9998 -7.9998 1.7004 79484019916 269.*

Z a (-SES *a e) (1988)*	21/55	21/55	11	M e b c (ba)	NY	1985-1986	H
S (1989)	200/438	200/438	12	8 a e (b ba)	MD, D.C.	1987-1988	H
S edec (1989)	264/535	264/535	12	10 b c a d a e	PA	1988-1989	H
S (1990)	631/1,132	631/1,132	12	14 a e (b ba)	MD, NJ	1989	H
P e a d R c (1999)	427/2,086	427/2,086	11 , 12	M e b c a d a e	USA	1995-1996	M ed
B (2001)	503/3,144	503/3,144	11 , 12	M e b c a d a e	USA	1991-1992	M ed
Ra d ed d e Sc -ba ed c ac							
R be a d O e e *(1966)*	154/265	188/310	12	18 b c (a B ac , ba , a d a)	TN	1965	L
E a a d P e (1973)	NA	288/417	11	12 b c (ba a d b ba)	NJ, OH, PA	1970-1971	M ed
A de a a d P e *(1980)*	239/559	NA	11	8 b c a d a e	7 Ne E a d a e	1977-1978	M ed
J (Sa F a c c *e) (1984)*	23/35	23/35	11	M e b c (a B ac , ba)	CA	1983-1994	L
S a (1992)	61/122	61/122	12	3 b c (b ba)	CA	1988	M ed
C e c a c ac							
Z a (-SES a e) *(1988)*	16/33	16/33	11	M e b c (ba)	NY	1985-1986	L

(c ed)

C e -ba ed c ac							
H e e (1984)	42/71	61/93	9 , 10 , 11	1 b c (b ba)	FL	NR	M ed
La c e e (1985)	13/27	13/27	11	1 a e (b ba Ca c)	NY	NR	M ed

S d	G a d Mea	SAT-M	C G	D	VI	MI	AI	IP	TP	TS	OA	HW	CI	WC	AC
H ee	1	1	1	3.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
F a e	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ha e	1	1	1	4	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
W a	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
S edec	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
W , C d , a d Ma e	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
S	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
S a	1	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sc ede	1	1	1	16	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
H e a d Keffe	1	0	1	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
W e	1	0	1	68	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
P e a d R c	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
B	1	1	1	**15**	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ka a Yea 1	1	1	0	30	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Ka a Yea 2	1	1	0	30	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0

NOTE: D = d a f c ac (b d a e a e bee ed a Bec e ' [1990] e e), VI = e ba c , MI = a c-, AI = a a c , IP = e ac ce, TP = e ac ce, TS = e - a , OA = e ac e , WC = a - c , AC = a e a-e c .

S d	*Yea*	*P b*	*Ma c*	*Ra d*	*ETS*	*Se*	*V*
H ee	82	0	0	1	0	1	2
F a e	87	0	0	0	0	2	2
Ha e	88	0	0	0	0	1	2
W a	88	1	0	0	0	2	2
S edec	89	1	0	0	0	2	2
W , C d , a d Ma e	89	0	0	0	0	2	2
S	90	1	0	0	0	2	2
S a	92	0	0	1	0	1	2
Sc ede	92	0	0	0	0	2	2
H e a d Keffe	95	1	0	1	0	2	2
W e	96	0	1	0	0	2	2
P e a d R c	99	1	0	0	1	1	2
B	101	1	0	0	0	1	2
Ka a Yea 1	101	1	0	0	0	2	2
Ka a Yea 2	101	1	0	0	0	2	2

1. [illegible] (1976) [illegible] (1987). [illegible]

2. A[illegible] 1994, [illegible]

3. [illegible] B[illegible] g_{hi}^{C} [illegible] g_{hi}^{U} [illegible] B[illegible] 1988). [illegible]

4. [illegible] C[illegible] (1999) [illegible] (1989) [illegible] 1990 [illegible]

5. B[illegible] 2.

6. D[illegible] B[illegible] (1989) [illegible]

7. [illegible] C[illegible] D.

8. [illegible] (1965).

9. [illegible] 10 [illegible]

10. [illegible] D[illegible] (1953), [illegible] (1955), D[illegible] (1958), [illegible] (1988), [illegible] A[illegible] (1980).

11. [illegible] (1985).

12. [illegible] B[illegible] (2004, [illegible] 4).

13. [illegible] B[illegible] L[illegible] (1987). [illegible]

A[illegible], D. [illegible] D. [illegible] 1980. [illegible]. *American Educational Research Journal* 17:239-53.

A[illegible], A. 1981. [illegible]. *American Psychologist* 36 (10): 1086-93.

B[illegible] B. [illegible]. 1988. [illegible]. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 41:257-78.

———. 1990. [illegible]. *Review of Educational Research* 60 (3): 373-417.

B[illegible], [illegible] A. 2004. *Regression analysis: A constructive critique.* [illegible], CA: [illegible].

B[illegible], [illegible] A., [illegible] D. A. [illegible]. 2003. [illegible]. *Law, punishment, and social control: Essays in honor of Sheldon Messinger,* [illegible]. B[illegible] [illegible], 235-54. [illegible]://[illegible]/[illegible]/[illegible]2[illegible].

B[illegible], [illegible]. 1989. [illegible]. *Educational measurement,* [illegible], 429-44. [illegible]: A[illegible] C[illegible]/[illegible].

B[illegible], [illegible] A., [illegible] A. [illegible]. 1987. *Writer's guide: Psychology.* [illegible], [illegible] A: D. C. [illegible].

B[illegible], D. C. 2001. [illegible]:88. *Chance* 14 (1): 10-18.

———. 2002. [illegible]. *Chance* 15 (1): 7-8.

———. 2002. [illegible] [illegible].D. [illegible] C[illegible], B[illegible].

———. 2004. C[illegible]. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* 29 (4): 397-420.

———. 2004. [illegible]: [illegible]. *Rethinking the SAT: Perspectives based on the November 2001 conference at the University of California, Santa Barbara,* [illegible], 217-34. [illegible].

B[illegible], [illegible] B. 1986. A [illegible] D[illegible], [illegible] A[illegible], [illegible] A[illegible] [illegible].D. [illegible], A[illegible].

C[illegible], [illegible] C. 1987. [illegible] C[illegible], [illegible].

C[illegible], [illegible]. 1967. [illegible]. *Personnel and G[illegible]*

[illegible] . 1979. *Effects of coaching standardized admission examinations: Revised statistical analyses of data gathered by the Boston Regional Office of the Federal Trade Commission.* [illegible], DC: [illegible].

[illegible] A. 1987. *The Princeton Review* [illegible] *The Newsletter.* D[illegible] A: D[illegible] A[illegible].

[illegible]. 1960. [illegible] *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 38:713-19.

[illegible]. 1955. *The coach ability of the SAT in public schools.* [illegible].

[illegible]. 2000. [illegible] 25. [illegible] 25. [illegible].

[illegible], B. [illegible]. 1981. *Meta-analysis in social research.* B[illegible], CA: [illegible].

[illegible]. 1988. [illegible]. D[illegible], A[illegible].

[illegible]. 1990. D[illegible] *The futu[illegible] analysi[illegible]* [illegible], 11-2[illegible].

[illegible]. 1985. *Sta[illegible]stical [illegible]ethods [illegible]or meta-analys[illegible]* [illegible]: A[illegible].

[illegible], C. [illegible] 1995. A[illegible] 5[illegible]4 0 49 2 ( )-3. 3 0 7( ) 2190 4[illegible]84 / 38[illegible]( )-2 [illegible]

'07 T TD [(.)-

———. 1982. [illegible]. *The Educational Psychologist* 17 (2): 67-91.

[illegible] A. [illegible]. 1981. [illegible]. *Psychological Bulletin* 89:191-216.

[illegible]. 1986.

[illegible] 1988. [illegible]

Derek C. Briggs is an assistant professor specializing in quantitative methods and policy analy-