The title

First Author[1]

[1] Wilhelm-Wundt-University

Course Title

Professor Name

Due Date

Author Note

Enter author note here.

The authors made the following contributions. First Author: Conceptualization.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to First Author, Postal address. E-mail: my@email.com

The title

```
## Warning in matrix(value, n, p): data length [12] is not a sub-multiple or
## multiple of the number of columns [8]
```

Table 1

Overview of the Included Papers for Hypothesis 3

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Bedyńska et al. (2020)	Cross-sectional	319 male secondary school students	Effects of chronic stereotype threat on working memory and language achievement; counting span task, set switching task, and spatial location memory task (capacity)	IV: Chronic stereotype threat, Gender identification; DV: Working memory, Language achievement	Mediation analysis	Stereotype threat negatively impacted working memory capacity, with the latter mediating the relationship between stereotype threat and language achievement. $b = 2.81$, $\beta = 0.45$, $SE = 0.06$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [[0.34, 0.55]]. Higher gender identification moderated the effect of stereotype threat on working memory. $r = 0.32$.	Yes

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Bedyńska et al. (2018)	Cross-sectional	624 female secondary school students	Effects of chronic stereotype threat on working memory and maths achievement; Functional Aspects of Working Memory Test (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Chronic stereotype threat, Gender identification; DV: Working memory, Maths achievement	Mediation analysis	Working memory mediated the relationship between stereotype threat and maths achievement. β = 0.50, indirect effect β = -0.14, 95% CI [[-0.20, -0.07]]. Higher gender identification moderated the negative effect of stereotype threat on working memory. b = -0.01, β = -0.29, SE = 0.14, p = .039. r = 0.20.	Yes

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Beilock et al. (2007)	Experimental	Experiment 1: 31 female college students; Experiment 3A: 33 female college students; Experiment 4: 30 female college students; Experiment 5: 33 female college students	Effects of stereotype threat on working memory and its influence on unrelated tasks; modular arithmetic (processing speed); n-back task (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Group (stereotype threat vs. control), Problem working memory demand (low vs. high), Block (baseline vs. posttest); DV: Accuracy, Reaction time	ANOVA	High-demand problems showed a significant decrease in accuracy at the post-test, CI [81.00% - 97.00%]; d = 0.61. F(1,29) = 11.18, η_p^2 = 0.28.	Yes
Brown and Harkins (2016)	Experimental	73 female undergraduates	Effects of stereotype threat on mind-wandering and task performance; SART (processing speed, accuracy)	IV: Condition (stereotype threat vs. control), SART framing (related vs. unrelated); DV: Mind-wandering (SART performance)	ANOVA	Significant effect of the mere effort account: commission errors F(1, 69) = 28.78, $p < .001$, η_p^2 = 0.29. Counter-hypothesis not supported.	No

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Guardabassi and Tomasetto (2020)	Cross-sectional	176 primary school children	Effects of BMI and stereotype threat on working memory; N-back task (capacity, accuracy)	IV: BMI, Stereotype threat; DV: Working memory	Mixed-effects models	zBMI negatively correlated with working memory under threat. $F =$	12.40
Hutchison et al. (2013)	Experimental	187 men	Effects of stereotype threat on working memory and Stroop performance; OSPAN (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Working memory capacity, List congruency, Stereotype threat condition; DV: Stroop task performance	Regression analysis	Stroop effect larger under threat for low WMC individuals. $\beta = 0.12$, $\beta =$ -0.11, $\beta = 0.24$*.	Partially
Jamieson and Harkins (2007)	Experimental	224 undergraduates across 4 experiments	Effects of stereotype threat on task performance requiring inhibitory control; saccade tasks (processing speed, accuracy)	IV: Condition (stereotype threat vs. control), Task type (antisaccade vs. prosaccade), Cognitive load; DV: Accuracy, Reaction time, Eye movements	ANOVA	Support for mere effort account in most conditions. Antisaccade task: $F(1, 72) = 17.28$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.98$. Condition x Task: $F(1, 72) = 4.85$, $p = .050$.	Mostly No

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Johns et al. (2008)	Experimental	176 participants across 3 experiments	Effects of stereotype threat on working memory and emotion regulation; reading span task (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Condition (stereotype threat vs. control), Emotion regulation strategy; DV: Working memory capacity, Maths performance, Self-reported anxiety	ANOVA, mediation analysis	Working memory impaired under threat, mediated maths performance. $t(55) = 2.31$, $\beta = 0.30$*.	Yes
Pennington et al. (2019)	Experimental	124 female university students	Effects of stereotype condition on task performance; anti-saccade task (accuracy, processing speed)	IV: Stereotype condition; DV: Task performance	ANOVA	No significant effects of threat on performance. Anti-saccade task: $F(2, 58) = 0.30$, $p = .750$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$.	No

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Rydell et al. (2009)	Experimental	57 female undergraduates	Effects of multiple social identities on stereotype threat and working memory; vowel counting task (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Gender stereotype, College student stereotype; DV: Working memory capacity, Maths performance	ANOVA, mediation analysis	Working memory capacity mediated stereotype effects on maths performance. $F(1, 53) = 6.01$, $p = .020$, $\eta^2_p = 0.10$. Sobel test: $z = 1.96$, $p = .050$.	Yes
Schmader et al. (2009)	Experimental	188 participants across 2 experiments	Effects of stereotype threat on anxiety and working memory; Reading Span Test (capacity, processing speed)	IV: Prime condition, Self-reported anxiety; DV: Working memory performance	Regression analysis	Anxiety predicted lower working memory under stereotype threat. β = -0.20, $p = .050$. Prime x Anxiety interaction significant: β = -0.30, $p < .040$.	Partially

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Schmader and Johns (2003)	Experimental	151 undergraduates across 3 experiments	Effects of stereotype threat on working memory and maths performance; reading span task (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Condition (stereotype threat vs. control); DV: Working memory capacity, Maths test performance	ANOVA, mediation analysis	Working memory capacity predicted maths performance. $F(1, 54) = 23.84$, $p < .001$. Mediation: Sobel test $z = 2.26$, $p < .020$.	Yes
Tine and Gotlieb (2013)	Experimental	71 undergraduates	Effects of gender-, race-, and income-based stereotype threat on working memory; Automated Working Memory Assessment (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Gender, Race, Income level, Number of stigmatized aspects; DV: Working memory performance	ANOVA	Significant effects of stereotype threat on working memory performance. $F(1, 68) = 4.91$, $p < .050$, $\eta^2_p = 0.07$; $F(1, 68) = 16.73$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = 0.20$.	Yes

Table 1 continued

Citation	Study Design	Population	Research Questions	Variables	Methods of Data Analysis	Results	Hypothesis confirmed
Van Loo and Rydell (2013)	Experimental	131 female undergraduates	Effects of power prime on stereotype threat and working memory; letter-memory task (capacity, accuracy)	IV: Power prime, Stereotype threat condition; DV: Working memory capacity, Maths performance	ANOVA, mediation analysis	High power prime protected working memory from stereotype threat effects. $F(2, 125) =$ 13.38***, mediated by working memory capacity. $z =$ -3.53***.	Mostly

Note. This table summarises studies investigating working memory impairment under stereotype threat. The 'Variables' column focuses on working memory measures and associated performance indicators. 'Methods of Data Analysis' details specific working memory tasks employed, such as complex span tasks, operational span tasks, or reading span tests. 'Results' highlight changes in working memory capacity and performance under stereotype threat. Asterisks indicate the significance level: *p $<$ .05, **p $<$ .01, ***p $<$ .001.