

To the Editor, *Nursing Research*:

The article by Krause et al. (2010) concerning the testing of mediation in nursing research thoroughly presents the case against using the methods described by Baron and Kenny (1986). However, their conclusion that the joint significance test of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  is the best alternative due to its computational ease and versatility may ignore some recent contributions to mediation analysis methodology. SPSS and SAS software programs for mediation analysis created by Preacher and Hayes (2004, 2008) allow researchers to easily use bootstrapping methods to test for mediation effects. The bootstrapping procedure does not require a normal distribution for the mediated or indirect effect, and thus provides the versatility of a nonparametric procedure. In addition, the program for multiple mediators (2008) offers the ability to include more than one potential mediating variable in the model. Given these recent user-friendly improvements in mediation analysis methods, the advantages of using the joint significance test do not appear to be clear-cut.

Stanley G. Cron, M.S.P.H.  
Research Instructor  
Center for Nursing Research, School of Nursing  
The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

#### References

- Krause, M. R., Serlin, R. C., Ward, S. E., Rony, R. Y., Ezenwa, M. O., & Naab, F. (2010). Testing mediation in nursing research: beyond Baron and Kenny. *Nursing Research, 59*, 288-294.
- Preacher, K. J. & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36*, 717-731.
- Preacher, K. J. & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 879-891.