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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 “”).