

Download File PDF Pharmacist Research Paper

#Jenny



Finally I get this ebook, thanks for all these I can get now!

#Rio



Cool! I'am really happy

#Markus Jensen



I did not think that this would work, my best friend showed me this website, and it does! I get my most wanted eBook

#Hun Tsu



wtf this great ebook for free?!

#Che Salsa



My friends are so mad that they do not know how I have all the high quality ebook which they do not!

#Diego Butler



so many fake sites. this is the first one which worked! Many thanks

[Download PDF version of : Pharmacist Research Paper](#)

His prevention behavior scale: testing for factorial invariance across lower class...

and upper class students, it will be modified accordingly and become the hypothesized multi-group model under test. Because the estimation of the baseline model involves no between-group constraints, the data was analyzed separately for each group. However, in testing for invariance equality constraints were imposed on particular parameters and then allowing for the data for the two groups to analyzed simultaneously to obtain efficient estimates (Bollen, 2005; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). A number of robust tests were used to evaluate the goodness of fit of the four-factor unidimensional (RMSEA) configural model. The results showed fit was assessed using the square (χ^2) statistics, with low χ^2 considered good fit (Hair et al., 2006). Incremental fit was evaluated using the Bentler-McGinnis Index of Approximation (RMSEA) with a value less than 0.06 indicating a relatively good fit, along with Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) with values of 95 or greater considered desirable (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Hair et al., 2006; Bollen, 2005; Brown, 2009). Assessing invariance involved comparing the goodness of fit for the configural model to the operational measurement and structural model, with evidence of invariance claimed if the χ^2 difference ($\Delta\chi^2$) value is statistically significant (Brown, 2002; Jöreskog, 1971) under the CFI difference (ΔCFI) is less than 0.01 (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Brown, 2009).

III. RESULTS

Table 1 displays the goodness of fit results for the RMSEA multi-group invariance. The results related to five multi-group model testing for the configural invariance result the χ^2 value to be 113.716 with 96 degree of freedom. The CFI and RMSEA values are .982 and .022 respectively. From the information, we conclude that the hypothesized multi-group configural model of the RMSEA structure is well fitting across lower class and upper class (BIC) students. The results goodness of fit statistics for the measurement model shows the fit to be fairly consistent with the configural model (CFI = .982, RMSEA = .022). The test for factor loadings invariance results a non-significant χ^2 difference between the configural model and the measurement model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 6.948, p = .05$), and a CFI difference of .001. Thus, these results provide evidence of factor invariance between lower class and upper class (BIC) students for the measurement model of RMSEA scale. The results of the fit for structural invariance shows the factor contributions to be equivalent across lower class and upper class (BIC) students ($\Delta\chi^2 = 19.000, p = .01$), $\Delta CFI = .001$.

Table 2. Goodness of fit statistics for the RMSEA Prevention Behavior Scale multi-group invariance.

Model Description	Comparative Model	χ^2	df	Stat. Sig.	CFI	ΔCFI
Factor 1: Baseline model for each academic class student						
Lower Class Students		61.289	56		.979	-
Upper Class Students		64.923	56		.976	-
Factor 2: Factorial invariance across students in academic class groups						
1. Configural Model					.982	-
Measurement model		113.716	96		.982	-
2. Measurement model						
Model A: Factor loadings invariance						
Equal	2A versus 1	120.664	104	6.948	.981	.001
3. Structural Model						
Model B: with covariances among (EMSE, PMSE, DMSE) & BBPV on structural						
Equal	3B versus 1	132.716	114	19.000	.981	.005

Note: $\Delta\chi^2$ = difference in χ^2 between constrained and unconstrained model; ΔCFI = difference in degree of freedom between unconstrained and unconstrained model; BIC = difference in Comparative Fit Index between unconstrained and constrained model; NS = Not significant at probability < .01.

RMSEA=Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA)

Lower class baseline model: .055

Upper class baseline model: .027

Model 1 (configural): .022

Model 2 (Measurement): .024

Model 3 (Structural): .023