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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 “”).
    - Papers coded “IV” changed to “” ← haven’t finished this one yet
* 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
* 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
* 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
  + 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