Study	Total Mean	SD	Mean	MRAW	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Manager Comprehension			()				
Measure = Comprehension Legacy et al. (2016)	50 2.50	67.5824		2.50	[-16.23; 21.24]	0.3%	2.0%
Nicoladis et al. (2018) – Very dominant	25 8.70	8.1000	+	8.70	[5.52; 11.88]	10.7%	2.0%
Nicoladis et al. (2018) – Slight dominant	18 15.60	12.6000	#	15.60	[9.78; 21.42]	3.2%	2.6%
De Houwer & Bornstein (2006)	31 17.60	15.2000	=	17.60	[12.25; 22.95]	3.8%	2.6%
Nicoladis et al. (2018) – Balanced	18 23.50	10.9000	=	23.50	[18.46; 28.54]	4.2%	2.6%
Jardak & Byers-Heinlein (2019) - Study 3	16 31.78	35.2006	- • -	31.78	[14.53; 49.03]	0.4%	2.1%
Jardak & Byers-Heinlein (2019) - Study 2	16 39.71	53.9360	<u> </u>	39.71	[13.28; 66.13]	0.2%	1.6%
Houston-Price et al. (2010)	19 42.00	36.1245	 • • • • • • • • • 	42.00	[25.76; 58.24]	0.4%	2.2%
Byers-Heinlein & Werker (2013) - Comprehension	20 46.00	14.0000	-	46.00	[39.86; 52.14]	2.9%	2.6%
Legacy et al. (2017) – Expt 2 Checklist	20 52.00	24.0000		52.00	[41.48; 62.52]	1.0%	2.4%
Legacy et al. (2016)	50 53.65	77.1071	<u> </u>	53.65	[32.28; 75.02]	0.2%	1.9%
Legacy et al. (2017) – Expt 2 Task	20 68.00	27.0000		68.00	[56.17; 79.83]	0.8%	2.4%
Common effect model	303		0	21.16	[19.20; 23.12]	27.9%	
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 368.4932$, $p < 0.01$				32.89	[21.36; 44.42]		27.8%
Measure = Production							
Gatt et al. (2008)	10 3.82	174.5325 -		- 3.82 [-104.36; 111.99]	0.0%	0.2%
Bail et al. (2015)	24 6.74	214.8564		6.74	[-79.22; 92.70]	0.0%	0.3%
Weatherhead et al. (2021) – Expt 2	24 7.41	7.7257	-	7.41	[4.32; 10.50]	11.2%	2.7%
Gatt (2017)	65 9.50	16.8820	-	9.50	[5.39; 13.60]	6.4%	2.6%
Gatt (2017)	65 11.59	14.6422	+	11.59	[8.03; 15.15]	8.5%	2.7%
Rinker et al. (2017)	19 12.57	12.5204	=	12.57	[6.94; 18.20]	3.4%	2.6%
Weatherhead et al. (2021) – Expt 1	24 15.79	22.0774		15.79	[6.96; 24.62]	1.4%	2.5%
Pettenati et al. (2011)	12 17.05	10.9051	-	17.05	[10.88; 23.22]	2.8%	2.6%
Marchman et al. (2010)	26 19.79	64.0585	1:	19.79	[-4.83; 44.41]	0.2%	1.7%
Mancilla-Martinez & Vagh (2013) – 24mo	16 25.00				[-25.04; 75.04]	0.0%	0.8%
Byers-Heinlein & Werker (2013) - Production Mancilla-Martinez & Vagh (2013) - 27mo	20 26.00 14 26.00	93.8681		26.00 26.00	[18.55; 33.45] [-23.17; 75.17]		2.6% 0.8%
Mancilla-Martinez & Vagh (2013) - 27110 Mancilla-Martinez & Vagh (2013) - 30mo	27 27.00	89.4762		27.00	[-6.75; 60.75]		1.3%
Mancilla-Martinez & Vagh (2013) - 33mo	18 28.00	67.5665		28.00	[-3.21; 59.21]		1.4%
Mancilla-Martinez & Vagh (2013) - 36mo	24 28.00	69.6557		28.00	[0.13; 55.87]	0.1%	1.6%
Holowka et al. (2002)	6 28.00	7.0000		28.00	[22.40; 33.60]	3.4%	2.6%
Weatherhead et al. (2021) – Expt 3	24 28.57	34.0901	- 1 : - 1 :	28.57	[14.93; 42.21]		2.3%
Pearson et al. (1995)	27 29.12	18.2577	+	29.12	[22.23; 36.00]	2.3%	2.6%
Tare & Gelman (2010) - Younger	14 36.38	20.8203	+ + - - -	36.38	[25.47; 47.29]	0.9%	2.4%
Poulin-Dubois et al. (2013)	25 37.40	21.2000	-in-	37.40	[29.09; 45.71]	1.6%	2.5%
Bosch & Ramon–Casas (2014)	24 38.39	47.3063		38.39	[19.46; 57.31]		2.0%
Tare & Gelman (2010) – Older	14 39.89	8.6105	+	39.89	[35.38; 44.40]	5.3%	2.6%
Junker & Stockman (2002)	10 43.70	19.8100	i 	43.70	[31.42; 55.98]	0.7%	2.4%
Poulin–Dubois et al. (2018)	36 46.88	18.6100	=	46.88	[40.80; 52.96]	2.9%	2.6%
Crivello et al. (2016) – Wave 1	39 46.89 26 47.00	19.0000 22.0000		46.89 47.00	[40.93; 52.85]	3.0%	2.6% 2.5%
Frank & Poulin-Dubois (2002) - Younger Legacy et al. (2017) - Expt 1 Wave 1	34 48.53	16.0000	-	48.53	[38.54; 55.46] [43.15; 53.91]	1.5% 3.7%	2.5%
Engel de Abreu et al. (2012)	40 49.82	33.9651		49.82	[39.29; 60.34]		2.4%
Frank & Poulin–Dubois (2002) – Older	28 51.00	29.0000	i	51.00	[40.26; 61.74]		2.4%
Legacy et al. (2017) – Expt 1 Wave 2	34 52.84	16.0000	-	52.84	[47.46; 58.22]	3.7%	2.6%
Crivello et al. (2016) – Wave 2	39 57.75	25.0500		57.75	[49.89; 65.61]		2.5%
Legacy et al. (2017) – Expt 1 Wave 3	34 61.15	22.0000		61.15	[53.76; 68.54]	2.0%	2.6%
Tsui et al. (2021)	200 71.26	220.3971		71.26	[40.72; 101.81]	0.1%	1.4%
Bird et al. (2005)	11 71.67	36.2109	i	71.67	[50.27; 93.07]	0.2%	1.9%
Common effect model	1053		»	27.87	[26.65; 29.09]	72.1%	
Random effects model				35.38	[29.22; 41.53]		72.2%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 = 262.2338$, $p < 0.01$							
Common effect model Random effects model	1356		♦	26.00 34.65	[24.96; 27.04] [29.24; 40.07]	100.0% 	 100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 = 284.1971$, $p < 0.01$		Γ		2			
Test for subgroup differences (fixed effect): $\chi_1^2 = 32.38$, or	$df = 1 \ (p < 0.01)$	<u>–1</u> 0	00 –50 0 50 100)			
Test for subgroup differences (random effects): $\chi_1^2 = 0.14$	4, df = 1 ($p = 0$.	71)					