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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
      * Total # Issues = n/a
    - Resolution:
      * Using the row from the RA to whom article was assigned (in Green 2)
      * Unused row in Yellow 2
  + 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)
    - 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
* 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 “sesIVorD\V” 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 “Yes, 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
    - Resolution:
      * Recoded “sesMainEffect” to “No”