5.15.20 = Start date

All changes:

* Clean codes for “sesIVorDV”
  + Why: RA’s used slightly different versions of codes for this section
  + Original:
    - Could indicate either IV or DV if “Yes” was answered. “No” was reserved for papers that did not examine SES.
  + Changes:
    - “Yes” replaced with only “IV” or “DV”
    - “No” or “\*SES not found” replaced with “Did not study SES”
* Clean codes for “sesMainEffect”
  + Why: RA’s used slightly different versions of codes for this section
  + Original:
    - RA’s used slightly different capitalization (e.g., “yes” vs. “Yes”)
    - Some answered “No” for papers that did not examine SES
  + Changes:
    - Capitalized all codes (i.e., from “yes” to “Yes”)
    - For papers that did not examine SES (see “sesIVorDV”), removed any codes given (e.g., from “No” to “”).
    - Paper coded “IV” changed to “Yes”
* Clean codes for “sesMainInterest”
  + Why: RA’s used slightly different versions of codes for this section
  + Original:
    - RA’s used slightly different capitalization (e.g., “yes” vs. “Yes”)
    - Some answered “No” for papers that did not examine SES
  + Changes:
    - Capitalized all codes (i.e., from “yes” to “Yes”)
    - For papers that did not examine SES (see “sesIVorDV”), removed any codes given (e.g., from “No” to “”).
* Highlight papers to revisit accuracy of codes
  + Why: Some codes had inconsistencies
  + Original:
    - “No” for “sesIVorDV” with other responses answered affirmatively
    - “IV” for “studiesMainEffect”
    - “IV” for “sesMainInterest”
    - Listed an operationalization of SES as a definition of SES
    - Answered affirmatively for multiple variables but left “SESDef” blank
  + Changes:
    - Highlighted entire row in Yellow 2
* Clean codes for “SESDef”
  + Why: RA’s used slightly different versions of codes for this section
  + Original:
    - RA’s used slightly different capitalization (e.g., “yes” vs. “Yes”)
    - Some answered “None given” for papers that did not examine SES
  + Changes:
    - Changed all versions of “none given” to “None given”
    - For papers that did not examine SES (see “sesIVorDV”), removed any codes given (e.g., from “none given” to “”).
* Clean codes for study operationalization columns
  + Why: RA’s used slightly different versions of codes for this section
  + Original:
    - RA’s used different codes to indicate that SES wasn’t studied in particular study (e.g., “n/a”, “not studied”, “none given”)
    - RA’s put “none given” for papers that didn’t study SES (see “sesIVorDV”)
  + Changes:
    - For particular studies that didn’t examine SES, but the overall paper did, changed whichever code was given to “Did not study SES”
    - For papers that did not study SES (see “sesIVorDV”), removed any codes given (e.g., from “none given” to “”).
* Clean codes for reasons for study operationalization columns
  + Why: RA’s used slightly different versions of codes for this section
  + Original:
    - RA’s used different codes to indicate that SES wasn’t studied in particular study (e.g., “n/a”, “not studied”, “none given”)
    - RA’s put “none given” for papers that didn’t study SES (see “sesIVorDV”)
  + Changes:
    - For particular studies that didn’t examine SES, but the overall paper did, changed whichever code was given to “Did not study SES”
    - For papers that did not study SES (see “sesIVorDV”), removed any codes given (e.g., from “none given” to “”).
* Overlapping papers with no issues to resolve:
  + Use rules:
    - Row to use highlighted in Green 2
    - Row(s) not to use highlighted in Yellow 2
  + Papers:
    - Hudson, 2005
    - Bigler et al., 2003
    - Appleton et al., 2012
    - Dinescu et al., 2016
    - Kraus et al., 2013 (added “none given for objective indicators” to reason)
    - Bollen & Bauldry, 2011
    - Belmi et al., 2019
    - Brandt, 2013
    - Davis & Humphrey, 2014
    - Evans et al., 2019
    - Hittner et al., 2018
    - Hrgović & Hromatko, 2019
    - Piff et al., 2010
* Overlapping papers with issues to resolve:
  + Cronk et al., 2004
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA marked SES as a DV
      * 1 RA used the operationalization quote as the definition quote
      * Total # Issues = 2 (out of 6 codes total)
    - Resolution:
      * 1 RA got all codes correct (row highlighted in Green 2); using that RA’s row for analysis
      * Rows with issues marked in Yellow 2
  + Falconnier & Elkin, 2008
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA marked Yes for “studiesMainEffect”; other didn’t
      * Total # Issues = 1 (out of 6 codes total)
    - Resolution:
      * SES was a moderator, and therefore not a main effect: “Hypotheses regarding the moderating effect of SES on the rela-tionships between the three approach variables and outcome andattrition were also tested.” (p. 38)
      * Using row of RA that got all correct (highlighted in Green 2)
      * Row with issue marked in Yellow 2
  + Rajendran et al., 2013:
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA put “Yes” for “studiesMainEffect”
      * Total # Issues = 1 (out of 6 codes total)
    - Resolution:
      * Used 1 of 2 rows with all correct answers (in Green 2)
      * Unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Corso et al., 2016
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA did not answer “S1\_reason”
      * 1 RA put “None given” for “sesDef”
      * Total # Issues = 2 (out of 6 total codes)
    - Resolution:
      * 1 RA got all correct; using that row (marked in Green 2)
      * Other rows marked in Yellow 2
  + Obradovic et al., 2017
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA put completely opposite answers for “sesIVorDV”, “studiesMainEffect”, and “sesMainInterest”
      * Total # Issues = 3 (out of 6 total codes)
    - Resolution:
      * RA who put “IV”, “Yes”, “Yes” for “sesIVorDV”, “studiesMainEffect”, and “sesMainInterest” was correct so using that row (highlighted in Green 2)
      * Unused row in Yellow 2
  + Bijttebier & Goethals, 2006
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA put “IV” for “sesIVorDV” and “None given” for all quotes; other RA’s put “Did not study SES”
      * Total # Issues = n/a (looks like erring RA used idiosyncratic marker for “Did not study SES”)
    - Resolution:
      * Paper did not study SES; changed off row to “Did not study SES” with rest of entries deleted
      * Used row in Green 2; unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Pinderhughes et al., 2000
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA put “No” for “studiesMainEffect” and “sesMainInterest”
      * 1 RA put “None given” for “S1\_reason”
      * Total # Issues = 3 (out of 6 total codes)
    - Resolution:
      * Row with “None given” for “S1\_reason” had all correct answers; using and marked in Green 2
      * Other row marked in Yellow 2
  + Tsethlikai, 2011
    - Issues:
      * Slightly incomplete operationalization and reason, but overall, all correct
      * Total # issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * For used row, added “additionally, used partial least squares to composite income and education as weighted indicators of SES—kind of a formative approach, a non-causal indicator approach (p. 196–197, 199)” to operationalization and added “none given for indicators” to reason
      * Used row in Green 2; unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Capaldi et al., 2002
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA missed reason for composite variable; other included composite only in reason; one got all correct
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolutions:
      * Using the one that had everything in exact place (Green 2)
      * Unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Shaked et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * 1 RA gave quote for reason where none should have been given
      * 1 RA gave “No” for “studiedMainEffect” and “sesMainInterest” when both should have been “Yes”
      * Total # Issues = 3 (out of 6 total)
    - Resolution:
      * Using row from RA who got all codes correct (in Green 2)
      * Unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Bjornsdottir & Rule, 2019
    - Issues:
      * RA’s agreed on paper qualities codes, but did not answer quotes
      * This is my fault: Told RA’s not to code quotes for papers where SES=DV
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * I coded the article
      * Used row in Green 2; unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Bjorsndottir & Rule, 2017
    - Issues:
      * Rows from 2 RA’s were accidentally copied over due to including articles based on author-name-matching, rather than author-name-year-matching
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Using the row from the RA to whom article was assigned (in Green 2)
      * Unused rows in Yellow 2
  + Greitemeyer & Saglioglou, 2016
    - Issues:
      * Row from 1 RA was accidentally copied over due to including articles based on author-name-matching, rather than author-name-year-matching
      * From used row, “S4\_reason” describes why research was done, rather than why the particular operationalization was used
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Using the row from the RA to whom article was assigned (in Green 2)
      * Unused row in Yellow 2
      * Upon reviewing Study 4, following reason for operationalization was found, which is now used: “Study 3 showed that low subjective SES causally increasesaggression. Although the manipulation suggests that we success-fully induced differences in the experience of social status, somereaders may be concerned that our manipulation in Study 3 primesmaterialistic desires or aspirations. Hence, in Study 4, we em-ployed a different approach to manipulate subjective SES. Con-cretely, we adapted a procedure byCallan, Shead, and Olson(2011)(see alsoBrown-Iannuzzi, Lundberg, Kay, & Payne, 2015;Callan, Ellard, Shead, & Hodgins, 2008). After answering a seriesof questions, participants were randomly assigned to either learnthat they have a higher SES than similar others, an SES in theaverage range of the socioeconomic status of similar others, or alower SES than similar others.” (p. 185)
  + Greitemeyer & Saglioglou, 2018
    - Issues:
      * Row from 1 RA was accidentally copied over due to including articles based on author-name-matching, rather than author-name-year-matching (+ RA had started but not finished coding the article)
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Using the row from the RA to whom article was assigned (in Green 2)
      * Unused row in Yellow 2
  + Jenkins et al., 2003
    - Issues:
      * RA’s disagree about “sesMainInterest”
      * RA’s used completely different quotes for operationalization and reason
      * Total # Issues = 3 (out of 6 codes total)
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * One of RA’s coded incorrect article (e.g., had quotes from “p. 545” when the article goes from only p. 99–113)
      * Using row of RA who coded the paper (in Green 2)
      * Unused row in Yellow 2
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
* Non-overlapping papers with issues to resolve:
  + Stattin et al., 2015
    - Issues:
      * RA marked “IV” for “sesIVorDV” and “None given” for all quotes on definition and operationalization of SES
    - Resolution:
      * Paper did not study SES. Current codes removed and “sesIVorDV” replaced with “Did not study SES”
      * Row highlighting changed to Orange 2
  + Demir et al., 2015
    - Issues:
      * RA marked “No” for “sesIVorDV” but included quote for operationalization of SES
    - Resolution:
      * Paper examined SES as a key counter-explanation for their focal explanation (“Here, we ask whether children’s early home environments varyin the opportunities they provide for children to hear decontextu-alized language and, if so, whether variation in parental decontex-tualized language input predicts children’s vocabulary, syntax, ornarrative skills at school entry, even when controlling for parentalcontextualized language input, demographic factors, and childpreschool language skill.” p. 161)
      * Thus, changed code to “IV, No, Yes, None Given, ‘For the two samples taken together, parent educationand income were combined in a composite score of SES. Thecomposite was generated using principal components analysis. Thefirst principal component weighted education and income posi-tively and equally and accounted for 81% of the original variance.’ p. 164, None Given”
      * Changed highlight to Orange 2
  + Raffington et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * RA did not update codes per my comments; paper did not study SES
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “sesIVorDV” to “Did not study SES”; deleted remaining answers
      * Highlighted in Orange 2
  + Schulting et al., 2005
    - Issues:
      * “sesIVorDV” is marked “Did not study SES” but operationalization has a quote
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “sesIVorDV” to “IV”, for SES was used as both a control variable and a moderator: “Hierarchical linear modelingrevealed that the number of school-based transition practices in the fall of kindergarten was associatedwith more positive academic achievement scores at the end of kindergarten, even controlling for familysocioeconomic status (SES) and other demographic factors. This effect was stronger for low- andmiddle-SES children than high-SES children.” (p. 860)
      * Highlighting to Orange 2
  + van Schaik et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * “No” for “sesIVorDV” when quote given for operationalization (RA didn’t follow my comments to update to “IV”
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “sesIVorDV” to “IV”
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Corley et al., 2010
    - Issues:
      * “No” for “sesIVorDV” when quote given for operationalization
    - Resolution:
      * SES used as key control variable, so “sesIVorDV” changed to “IV” and “sesMainInterest” changed to “Yes”
      * highlighting in Orange 2
  + Huijbregts et al., 2003
    - Issues:
      * “No” for “sesIVorDV” when quote given for operationalization
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “sesIVorDV” to “IV”
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Simons et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * Indicated SES studied in paper but no quote for operationalization
      * Gave a reason not related to studying or operationalizing SES
    - Resolution:
      * Entry was incomplete for quotes but correct for paper characteristics. Added missing quotes
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Preacher et al., 2016
    - Issues:
      * “sesIVorDV” marked “DV”, but no quotes given for definition and operationalization of SES
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Paper reviews method for MSEM. Example involves examining how SES relation to math scored moderated by school size. Paper did not report details of how any data were collected, processed, etc. Codes given reflect the particular example, rather than the overall paper.
      * Thus, “sesIVorDV” changed to “IV” and “sesMainInterest” changed to “Yes”
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Thielemann et al.,, 2017
    - Issues:
      * “sesIVorDV” marked as “IV” but no quotes given for operationalization or definition
      * Generally, RA didn’t update per my comments
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Updated per comments
      * Changed “sesMainInterest” to “Yes” to reflect particular example, rather than overall paper
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Adams et al., 2000
    - Issues:
      * quote for “S1\_reason” but none for definition or operationalization
      * “S1\_reason” quote is not a reason for the operationalization
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Paper did not study SES
      * All codes deleted and “sesIVorDV” changed to “Did not study SES”
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Espinoza & Willis-Esqueda, 2015
    - Issues:
      * RA marked “IV” for all paper codes
      * Total # Issues = 2 (out of 6 codes total)
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “studiesMainEffect” and “sesMainInterest” to “Yes”
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Schredl, 2013
    - Issues:
      * I mistakenly flagged paper because I thought “sesIVorDV” was answered affirmatively while no quotes were given, but quotes were given
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Speed & Fowler, 2017
    - Issues:
      * “sesIVorDV” marked “IV”, but no quotes given
      * RA did not update per my comments
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Added quotes for operationalization and reason
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Townsend et al., 2012
    - Issues:
      * Filled out some parts of codes, but not for Study 1 or “sesDef”
      * Quote for “S2\_reason” was not quite correct
      * Total # Issues = 3 (out of 9 codes total)
    - Resolution:
      * Completed “sesDef” and SE
      * Corrected “S2\_reason” (copied quote from “S2\_operationalization”, which contained reason for operationalization)
      * Highlighting in Orange 2
  + Hill & Herman-Stahl, 2002
    - Issues:
      * During coding, discovered paper used SES as a control variable
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why SES was controlled for rather than why the indicators of SES were chosen
    - Resolution:
      * Recoded “sesMainEffect” to “No”
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Gard et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization given in operationalization quote not given in reason quote
    - Resolution:
      * Copied operationalization quote into reason cell
  + Bayissa et al., 2017
    - Issues:
      * RA did not update to “Did not study SES” per my comments
    - Resolution:
      * Deleted all codes and made “sesIVorDV” “Did not study SES”
  + Carlson et al., 2014
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization in operationalization quote was not in reason quote (which was “None given”)
    - Resolution:
      * Copied operationalization quote into reason cell
  + Garner, 2006:
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization in operationalization quote was not in reason quote (which was “None given”)
    - Resolution:
      * Copied operationalization quote into reason cell
  + Navarro et al., 2007
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization in operationalization quote was not in reason quote (which was “None given”)
      * RA did not update “sesMainEffect” per my comments
    - Resolution:
      * Copied operationalization quote into reason cell
      * Changed “sesMainEffect” to “Yes”
  + Newcomb et al., 2002
    - Issues:
      * RA did not update “sesMainEffect” and “sesMainInterest” per my comments
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “sesMainEffect” and “sesMainInterest” to “Yes”
  + Stellar et al., 2012
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization in operationalization quote was not in reason quote (which was “None given”) (for both S2 and S3)
      * Given reason quote was not a reason for the operationalization (for both S2 and S3)
    - Resolution:
      * Copied operationalization quote into reason cell (for both S2 and S3)
      * Deleted old reason quote (for both S2 and S3)
  + Anton et al., 2014
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Yu & Seligman, 2002
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Betts et al., 2008
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + del Río et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Dulay et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + McCoach et al., 2006
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Obradovic et al., 2016
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Poehlmann et al., 2011
    - Issues
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following reason for operationalization, which is now used: “On the basis of previousresearch with children with a multiple risk model (e.g., Burchinal,Roberts, Hooper, & Zeisel, 2000), one point was given for each ofthe following risks: family income was below federal povertyguidelines adjusted for family size, both parents were unemployed,the mother was single, the mother gave birth to the target child asa teen, the family had four or more dependent children, the motherdid not complete high school, and the father did not complete highschool. This index could range from 0 to 7, with higher scoresreflecting more SES risks. Cronbach’s alpha was .75. Family SES risks at all other time points were highly correlated with NICU SES risks; we used the NICU SES risk index to minimize missing data” (p. 97)
  + Roberts et al., 2010
    - Issues
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following reason for operationalization, which is now used: “A student- or family-level measureof SES is provided in the ECLS data set, which is a composite offive variables reflecting family income and prestige of parents’occupation, each of which was standardized with a mean of 0 anda standard deviation of 1. The measure is treated as continuous andranges from – 4.75 to 2.75. The percentage of students who qual-ified for free or reduced lunch in the fall of 1999 was used as anindicator of schoolwide SES” (p. 672)
  + Andorko et al., 2019
    - Issues
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following reason for operationalization, which is now used: “SES variables wereselected based on their relative stability overtime and specific relation to health disparityintervention research (Shavers, 2007).” (p. 3)
  + Barbarin & Aikens, 2015
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Dicke et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * Reasons for operationalization quote described general modeling for testing all hypotheses, rather than SES
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewing supplementary materials and discovered SES measure was composite provided in the ECLS dataset, and changed to “Dataset provided\_None given”: “socioeconomic status – which was created based on the following components reported by the participant’s parents (guardians): father/male guardian’s education; mother/female guardian’s education; father/male guardian’s occupation; mother/female guardian’s occupation; and household income ( see Tourangeau et al., 2009 for details)….Tourangeau, K., Nord, C., Lê, T., Sorongon, A. G., and Najarian, M. (2009). *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998–99 (ECLS-K), Combined User’s Manual for the ECLS-K Eighth-Grade and K–8 Full Sample Data Files and Electronic Codebooks (NCES 2009–004).* National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.” (p. 4–10)
  + Ennemoser & Schneider, 2007
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Guo et al., 2019
    - Issues:
      * RA miscoded “sesIVorDV” as “DV”
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Changed “sesIVorDV” to “IV”
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Hittner et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * “S1\_reason” quote was missing one part
    - Resolution:
      * Added following to quote: “Follow-up analyses were conducted to determine (a)robustness of the findings when controlling for age, gender, race,and marital status (the latter only in Study 2; all participants weremarried in Study 1); (b) whether SES effects were driven byincome or education” (p. 1480)
  + Kilbanoff et al., 2006
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Kraus & Mendes, 2014
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed to “None given”
  + Lu et al., 2015
    - Issues:
      * For all studies: Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done, or the conclusion of the research, rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization, so changed reason for all studies to “None given”
  + Ménard & Ruback, 2003
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following reason for operationalization, which is now used: “From the Census, five variables generally found to correlate significantly withcrime rates were used as statistical controls: percentage of males between the ages of 15 and 24, percentage of residents living below the poverty level” (p. 392–393)
  + Mendes et al., 2007
    - Issues:
      * “S1\_reason” quote was missing one part
    - Resolution:
      * Added following to quote: “Therefore,we reasoned that White and Latino students would be expected byparticipants to differ socioeconomically. Specifically, Latino stu-dents would be expected to come from low-socioeconomic status(SES) families (based on stereotypes and demographic informa-tion), White students would be expected to come from high-SESfamilies, and the reverse would be unexpected.” (p. 700)
  + Piff et al., 2012
    - Issues:
      * “S1\_reason” quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
      * “S5\_reason” quote was missing a part
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found no reason for operationalization for Study 1, so changed to “None given”
      * Review Study5 and added following to reason for operationalization: “A principal-axis factor analysis using varimax rotation of thefive social class items yielded a single factor with an eigenvalueabove 1.0 (2.99) that accounted for 60% of the variance. All factorloadings exceeded .58. Moreover, the measures for childhoodsocial class (M4.66,SD1.39,.77) and current socialclass (M4.61,SD1.58,.77) were highly correlated,r(112).58,p.01, and the five items demonstrated highinternal consistency (.82). Thus, we formed a compositemeasure by averaging the five childhood and current social classitems (M4.64,SD1.29).” (p. 957)
  + Schöllgen et al., 2012
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following reason for operationalization, which is now used: “Morespecifically, we focus on education as one aspect of SES. Educa-tion is supposed to be central to the development of psychologicalresources such as control beliefs (Mirowsky & Ross, 2007) andmight thus shape the emotion– health link.” (p. 340)
  + Sturge-Apple et al., 2017
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following reason for operationalization, which is now used: “In order to create an index ofsocioeconomic risk, we followed previous guidelines (Conger etal., 2010;Dearing, McCartney, & Taylor, 2001) and created acomposite variable comprised of a family income-to-needs ratio,maternal education, and maternal report of level of chaos in theneighborhood...The three risk assessments were significantlycorrelated with one another (rs ranged from .27 to .52) and werestandardized and summed to create a composite measure of socio-economic risk. Higher scores indicated greater risk.” (p. 162)
  + Troy et al., 2017
    - Issues:
      * Reason quote for all studies was missing one part
    - Resolution:
      * Added following to all reason quotes: “Like others (Dubois, Rucker, & Galinsky, 2015, Study2;Piff, Kraus, Côté, Cheng, & Keltner, 2010, Study 4;Vinokur,Vine, & Caplan, 1996), we measured SES with current annualfamily income, which was rated on a 1 (“$10,000 or below”) to 12(“$200,000 or above”) scale (M5.27,SD3.06, range1–12; seeTable 1for distribution of income). Here, and in Studies 2 and3, we asked participants to report income using a scale rather thanabsolute income” (p. 142–143)
  + Kraus & Keltner, 2013
    - Issues:
      * “S4\_reason” for operationalization quote described why the research was done rather than why the operationalization of SES was selected
    - Resolution:
      * Reusing reason given from Studies 1 and 2 (gave same reason for those studies)
  + Falconnier, 2009
    - Issues:
      * Definition of SES simply listed names of researchers whose framework was used to define SES but did not itself define SES
    - Resolution:
      * “SESDef” changed to “None given”
  + Volbrecht & Goldsmith, 2010
    - Issues:
      * Missing part from reason for operationalization quote
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following quote which is now added to reason for operationalization: “Because the scores measured at study entry, 30 months, and the 7– 8 years of age follow-up were highly correlated (range 68 –.74), they were averaged into one overall SES score” (p. 1198)
  + Pff et al., 2010
    - Issues:
      * Missing part from reason for operationalization quote for Study 4
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following quote which is now added to reason for operationalization: “Because past and current income were significantly correlated, r(89) .65, p .01, we created a composite measure of income by taking the mean of these two indicators” (p. 779)
  + Wrosch et al., 2018
    - Issues:
      * Missing part from reason for operationalization quote
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following quote which is now added to reason for operationalization: “Because the three SES measures were positively correlated (rs .39 to .53, ps .01), we computed a composite score of SES for further analysis by averaging the three standardized measures (M .02, SD .81).” (pg.353)
  + Sentse et al., 2009
    - Issues:
      * Missing part from reason for operationalization quote
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following quote which is now added to reason for operationalization: “SES was measured as the average of the five items (standardized). The SES scale captures 61.2 percent of the variance in the five items and has an internal consistency of .84. Missing values (e.g., when there is only one parent in the family) did not affect the association of this scale with other variables.” (pg.423)
  + Johnson et al., 2011
    - Issues:
      * Reason for operationalization for Studies 2–4 should be same as for Study 1
    - Resolution:
      * Changed reason for operationalization for Studies 2–4 to that from Study 1
  + Karwowski, 2011
    - Issues:
      * Missing part from reason for operationalization quote
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following quote which is now added to reason for operationalization: “A student’s mother’s and father’s educational level was coded on a four-point scale (1 – elementary, 2 – vocational, 3 – high school, 4 – college/university) and then summed. The reliability of this scale was satisfactory ( .73).” (p.157)
  + De Clercq et al., 2019
    - Issues:
      * Missing part from reason for operationalization quote
    - Resolution:
      * Reviewed paper and found following quote which is now added to reason for operationalization: “Exploratory factor analysis revealed a single factor (eigenvalue higher than 1) that explained more than 56% of the variance and with factor loadings ranging from .60 to .83. A standardized factor score was extracted to create an overall SES indicator.” (p.71)