

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Table 1 and Table 2 report confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) results, separately for fathers and mothers. Information regarding the intercorrelations among the factors should be reported in the text or in a separate table. Table 1 provides an overview of fit indices for different factor solutions within CFA. It is important to report multiple factor solutions to establish that a certain factor solution is a better representation of the data than are other factor solutions. The fit indices in Table 1 are examples of fit indices that researchers may report. There are many measures of fit for confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling. The author should provide information on several of these and may want to give a reference justifying those that are included. Each year new measures emerge as well as better understanding of the distribution of established measures. It is normally expected that the RMSEA will be included. Chi-square, the degrees of freedom, and the probability of the chi-square must always be reported.

APA routinely rejects the use of acronyms, except for those that are widely used. Since the publication of the 5th edition of the APA Publication Manual, fit indices such as the RMSEA have been widely used and it may not be necessary to define them in a footnote. Any indices that are not widely used should be defined in specific table notes.

Table 1

Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of Models for Parent Report of Child Behavior Problems (n = 759)

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	χ^2/df	χ^2_{diff}	GFI	RMSEA
<i>Mothers (N = 384)</i>						
Single Factor	280.30***	20	1.67		.85	.11
Two Factor	120.80***	13	.72	159.50**	.93	.05
Three Factor	110.50***	7	.67	10.30	.94	.05
<i>Fathers (N = 375)</i>						
Single Factor	290.50***	20	1.83		.83	.13
Two Factor	130.20***	13	.83	160.30**	.92	.06
Three Factor	120.40***	7	.77	9.80	.93	.05

*** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Unstandardized Loadings (Standard Errors) and Standardized Loadings for 2-Factor Confirmatory Model of Child Behavior Problems for Fathers (n = 184) and Mothers (n = 175)

Item	Externalizing				Internalizing			
	Fathers		Mothers		Fathers		Mothers	
	Unstand- ardized	Stand- ardized	Unstand- ardized	Stand- ardized	Unstand- ardized	Stand- ardized	Unstand- ardized	Stand- ardized
Argues	1.00 (--)	.67	1.00 (--)	.75				
Fights	.50 (.20)	.75	.44 (.15)	.65				
Is impulsive	1.55 (.19)	.81	1.60 (.22)	.70				
Lies, cheats	.93 (.31)	.69	.85 (.33)	.51				
Is shy					1.00 (--)	.73	1.00 (--)	.75
Is withdrawn					.57 (.11)	.33	.48 (.18)	.55
Is sad					.70 (.18)	.44	.33 (.15)	.42

Table 2

Continued

Note: Dashes (--) indicate the standard error was not estimated. GFI = .93 (mothers), .92 (fathers); RMSEA = .05 (mothers), .06 (fathers). $\chi^2(13) = 120.80$; $p < .001$ for mothers; $\chi^2(13) = 130.20$; $p < .001$ for fathers. The covariance between the externalizing and internalizing latent variables is 1.75 for fathers and 1.55 for mothers. The correlation between externalizing and internalizing latent variables is .34 for fathers and .25 for mothers.