

Bedyńska et al. (2018)

EPPI-Centre (2003) & Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (2018)

If the study has a broad focus and this data extraction focuses on just one component of the study, please specify this here

- ☒ Not applicable (whole study is focus of data extraction)
- ☐ Specific focus of this data extraction (please specify)

Study aim(s) and rationale

Was the study informed by, or linked to, an existing body of empirical and/or theoretical research?

Please write in authors' declaration if there is one. Elaborate if necessary, but indicate which aspects are reviewers' interpretation.

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
 - Stereotype threat effects on working memory
 - Chronic vs temporary stereotype threat in the educational context, based on the occupational context
 - mediators of stereotype threat
 - intellectual helplessness

Do authors report how the study was funded?

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

- The presented study was a part of the system level project “Quality and Effectiveness of Education – Strengthening Institutional Research Capabilities” executed by the Educational Research Institute and co-financed by the European Social Fund (Human Capital Operational Program 2007–2013, Priority III High quality of the education system). This work was supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, under Grant 2015/17/B/HS6/04185, awarded to GS.

Study research question(s) and its policy or practice focus

What is/are the topic focus/foci of the study?

- test the consequences of chronic stereotype threat in a representative sample of secondary school female pupils
- We examined the effect of chronic stereotype threat on school achievement measured by school grades in mathematics.
- We also tested the mediational role of working memory.

What is/are the population focus/foci of the study?

- a representative sample of secondary school female pupils.

What is the relevant age group?

- ☐ Not applicable (focus not learners)
- ☐ 0 - 4
- ☐ 5 - 10
- ☒ 11 - 16
- ☐ 17 - 20
- ☐ 21 and over
- ☐ Not stated/unclear

What is the sex of the population focus/foci?

- ☐ Not applicable (focus not learners)
- ☒ Female only
- ☐ Male only
- ☐ Mixed sex
- ☐ Not stated/unclear

What is/are the educational setting(s) of the study?

- ☐ Community centre
- ☐ Correctional institution
- ☐ Government department
- ☐ Higher education institution
- ☐ Home
- ☐ Independent school
- ☐ Local education authority
- ☐ Nursery school
- ☐ Other early years setting
- ☐ Post-compulsory education institution
- ☐ Primary school
- ☐ Residential school
- ☒ Secondary school
- ☐ Special needs school
- ☐ Workplace
- ☐ Other educational setting

In Which country or countries was the study carried out?

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- Poland

Please describe in more detail the specific phenomena, factors, services, or interventions with which the study is concerned

What are the study research questions and/or hypotheses?

Research questions or hypotheses operationalise the aims of the study. Please write in authors' description if there is one. Elaborate if necessary, but indicate which aspects are reviewers' interpretation.

☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)

☐ Implicit (please specify)

☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

- We predicted the existence of similar reliable mediation between chronic stereotype threat and school achievements, when applying as the mediator three aforementioned functional aspects of working memory (simultaneous storage and processing, coordination, and supervision).
- We also predicted that there is an additional mediator which may explain the relationship between chronic stereotype threat and academic performance, namely intellectual helplessness
- We predict that chronic stereotype threat is associated with a higher level of intellectual helplessness and, in consequence, it decreases the effectiveness of working memory and lowers school grades in mathematics.

Methods - Design

Which variables or concepts, if any, does the study aim to measure or examine?

☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)

☐ Implicit (please specify)

☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

- Working memory functions and intellectual helplessness were examined as potential mediators
- Gender identification was included as a moderator of chronic stereotype threat effects

Study timing

Please indicate all that apply and give further details where possible.

If the study examines one or more samples, but each at only one point in time it is cross-sectional.

If the study examines the same samples, but as they have changed over time, it is retrospective, provided that the interest is in starting at one timepoint and looking backwards over time. If the study examines the same samples as they have changed over time and if data are collected forward over time, it is prospective provided that the interest is in starting at one timepoint and looking forward in time.

- ☒ Cross-sectional
- ☐ Retrospective
- ☐ Prospective
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

If the study is an evaluation, when were measurements of the variable(s) used for outcome made, in relation to the intervention?

If at least one of the outcome variables is measured both before and after the intervention, please use the before and after category.

- ☐ Not applicable (not an evaluation)
- ☒ Before and after
- ☐ Only after
- ☐ Other (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Methods - Groups

If comparisons are being made between two or more groups, please specify the basis of any divisions made for making these comparisons.

Please give further details where possible.

- ☒ Not applicable (not more than one group)
- ☐ Prospective allocation into more than one group (e.g. allocation to different interventions, or allocation to intervention and control groups)
- ☐ No prospective allocation but use of pre-existing differences to create comparison groups (e.g. receiving different interventions, or characterised by different levels of a variable such as social class)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

How do the groups differ?

- ☒ Not applicable (not more than one group)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Number of groups

For instance, in studies in which comparisons are made between groups, this may be the number of groups into which the dataset is divided for analysis (e.g. social class, or form size), or the number of groups allocated to, or receiving, an intervention.

- ☒ Not applicable (not more than one group)
- ☐ One
- ☐ Two
- ☐ Three
- ☐ Four or more (please specify)
- ☐ Other/unclear (please specify)

Was the assignment of participants to interventions randomised?

- ☒ Not applicable (not more than one group)
- ☐ Not applicable (no prospective allocation)
- ☐ Random
- ☐ Quasi-random
- ☐ Non-random
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Where there was prospective allocation to more than one group, was the allocation sequence concealed from participants and those enrolling them until after enrolment?

Bias can be introduced, consciously or otherwise, if the allocation of pupils or classes or schools to a programme or intervention is made in the knowledge of key characteristics of those allocated. For example: children with more serious reading difficulty might be seen as in greater need and might be more likely to be allocated to the ‘new’ programme, or the opposite might happen. Either would introduce bias.

- ☒ Not applicable (not more than one group)
- ☐ Not applicable (no prospective allocation)
- ☐ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Apart from the experimental intervention, did each study group receive the same level of care (that is, were they treated equally)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can’t tell

Study design summary

In addition to answering the questions in this section, describe the study design in your own words. You may want to draw upon and elaborate the answers you have already given.

- Data was collected in a single session that lasted 45 minutes, during regular school hours
- 1. Explaining procedure and aim of the study
- 2. Solving Functional Aspects of Working Memory Test
- 3. Online questionnaires (including scale of chronic stereotype threat, as seen in 5. this scale was actually last)
- 4. additional questions about school and learning
- 5. Stereotype threat scale

Methods - Sampling strategy

Are the authors trying to produce findings that are representative of a given population?

Please write in authors’ description. If authors do not specify please indicate reviewers’ interpretation.

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- secondary school female pupils

Which methods does the study use to identify people or groups of people to sample from and what is the sampling frame?

e.g. telephone directory, electoral register, postcode, school listing, etc. There may be two stages – e.g. first sampling schools and then classes or pupils within them.

- ☐ Not applicable (please specify)
- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- school

Which methods does the study use to select people or groups of people (from the sampling frame)?

e.g. selecting people at random, systematically - selecting for example every 5th person, purposively in order to reach a quota for a given characteristic.

- ☐ Not applicable (no sampling frame)
- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- The sampling procedure involved two steps.
- In the first step, 24 secondary schools were randomly sampled with stratification based on region (two regions of Poland) and school location (village, small city, medium city).
- In the second step, classes were randomly selected from each school and all students belonging to the class were invited as participants (655 female students were selected).
- only about 5% of the selected students did not take part in the study due to their absence at school
- Study was presented as aimed at testing new online educational games and none of the students resigned from the participation during the study.

Planned sample size

If more than one group please give details for each group separately.

- ☐ Not applicable (please specify)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☒ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Methods - Recruitment and consent***Which methods are used to recruit people into the study?***

e.g. letters of invitation, telephone contact, face-to-face contact.

- ☐ Not applicable (please specify)
- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

- invitations

Were any incentives provided to recruit people into the study?

- ☐ Not applicable (please specify)
- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

- Pupils did not receive compensation for their participation in the study

Was consent sought?

Please comment on the quality of consent if relevant.

- ☐ Not applicable (please specify)
- ☐ Participant consent sought
- ☒ Parental consent sought
- ☐ Other consent sought
- ☐ Consent not sought
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Are there any other details relevant to recruitment and consent?

- ☐ No
- ☒ Yes (please specify)

- The research protocol was approved by the Ethical Committee of the Educational Research Institute. The present study was conducted in compliance with ethical standards adopted by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2010). Accordingly, prior to participation, pupils were informed about the general aim of the research

and the anonymity of their data. Participation was voluntary, and the pupils did not receive compensation for their participation in the study. Additionally, parents signed a written consent for their children to participate in the study.

Methods - Actual sample

What was the total number of participants in the study (the actual sample)?

If more than one group is being compared please give numbers for each group.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- Six hundred twenty four ($N = 623$) females from gender mixed secondary schools ($M = 15.59$, $SD = 0.92$) took part in the study.

What is the proportion of those selected for the study who actually participated in the study?

Please specify numbers and percentages if possible.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- 100%

Which country/countries are the individuals in the actual sample from?

If UK, please distinguish between England, Scotland, N. Ireland, and Wales if possible. If from different countries, please give numbers for each. If more than one group is being compared, please describe for each group.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☒ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

What ages are covered by the actual sample?

Please give the numbers of the sample that fall within each of the given categories. If necessary, refer to a page number in the report (e.g. for a useful table). If more than one group is being compared, please describe for each group. If follow-up study, age at entry to the study.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ 0 to 4
- ☐ 5 to 10
- ☒ 11 to 16
- ☐ 17 to 20
- ☐ 21 and over
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

What is the socio-economic status of the individuals within the actual sample?

If more than one group is being compared, please describe for each group.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☒ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

What is the ethnicity of the individuals within the actual sample?

If more than one group is being compared, please describe for each group.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☒ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

What is known about the special educational needs of individuals within the actual sample?

e.g. specific learning, physical, emotional, behavioural, intellectual difficulties.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☒ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Is there any other useful information about the study participants?

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify no/s.)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☒ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

How representative was the achieved sample (as recruited at the start of the study) in relation to the aims of the sampling frame?

Please specify basis for your decision.

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☐ Not applicable (no sampling frame)
- ☒ High (please specify)

- ☐ Medium (please specify)
- ☐ Low (please specify)
- ☐ Unclear (please specify)

If the study involves studying samples prospectively over time, what proportion of the sample dropped out over the course of the study?

If the study involves more than one group, please give drop-out rates for each group separately. If necessary, refer to a page number in the report (e.g. for a useful table).

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☒ Not applicable (not following samples prospectively over time)
- ☐ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear

For studies that involve following samples prospectively over time, do the authors provide any information on whether and/or how those who dropped out of the study differ from those who remained in the study?

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☒ Not applicable (not following samples prospectively over time)
- ☐ Not applicable (no drop outs)
- ☐ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No

If the study involves following samples prospectively over time, do authors provide baseline values of key variables such as those being used as outcomes and relevant socio-demographic variables?

- ☐ Not applicable (e.g. study of policies, documents, etc)
- ☒ Not applicable (not following samples prospectively over time)
- ☐ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No

Methods - Data collection

Please describe the main types of data collected and specify if they were used (a) to define the sample; (b) to measure aspects of the sample as findings of the study?

- ☐ Details
 - functional aspects of working memory test -> b
 - online questionnaires, with scales of chronic stereotype threat, learned helplessness, gender identity, and mathematical achievement -> b
 - descriptive data -> a

- self-descriptive measures, regarding their learning motivation, attitudes toward school and learning -> b

Which methods were used to collect the data?

Please indicate all that apply and give further detail where possible.

- ☐ Curriculum-based assessment
- ☐ Focus group
- ☐ Group interview
- ☐ One to one interview (face to face or by phone)
- ☐ Observation
- ☐ Self-completion questionnaire
- ☐ Self-completion report or diary
- ☐ Exams
- ☐ Clinical test
- ☐ Practical test
- ☒ Psychological test
- ☐ Hypothetical scenario including vignettes
- ☐ School/college records (e.g. attendance records etc)
- ☐ Secondary data such as publicly available statistics
- ☐ Other documentation
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Details of data collection methods or tool(s).

Please provide details including names for all tools used to collect data and examples of any questions/items given. Also please state whether source is cited in the report.

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)
- Working Memory: Functional Aspects of Working Memory Test (FAWMT). FAWMT was adapted from the battery of experimental procedures used by Oberauer et al. (2000, 2003) and was selected to render the functional complexity of the construct of working memory.
 - Simultaneous storage and processing function of working memory: Adaptation of a counting span task (Conway et al., 2005)
 - Supervision function of working memory: Adopted the set switching task 2 x 2 (Rogers and Monsell, 1995)
 - Relational integration function of working memory: As proposed by Oberauer et al. (2003), a spatial location memory task was designed.

- Intellectual Helplessness: selected items from the Intellectual Helplessness Scale (IHS, Sedek and McIntosh, 1998)
- Chronic Stereotype Threat: seven items adapted from Steele and Aronson (1995, Experiment 4) and the Stereotype Vulnerability Scale used in the research in math tests among women (Spencer, 1994).
- Gender identity: One item: “Being a girl is important to me”, rating on a 6-point Likert type scale.
- Mathematical achievement: Actual Grade Point Average (GPA) in mathematics from two semesters before the study.

Who collected the data?

Please indicate all that apply and give further detail where possible.

- ☒ Researcher
- ☐ Head teacher/Senior management
- ☐ Teaching or other staff
- ☐ Parents
- ☐ Pupils/students
- ☐ Governors
- ☐ LEA/Government officials
- ☐ Other education practitioner
- ☐ Other (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear

Do the authors describe any ways they addressed the reliability of their data collection tools/methods?

e.g. test-retest methods (Where more than one tool was employed please provide details for each.)

- ☐ Details

Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity of their data collection tools/methods?

e.g. mention previous validation of tools, published version of tools, involvement of target population in development of tools. (Where more than one tool was employed please provide details for each.)

- ☐ Details

Was there concealment of study allocation or other key factors from those carrying out measurement of outcome – if relevant?

Not applicable – e.g. analysis of existing data, qualitative study. No – e.g. assessment of reading progress for dyslexic pupils done by teacher who provided intervention. Yes – e.g. researcher assessing pupil knowledge of drugs - unaware of pupil allocation.

- ☐ Not applicable (please say why)
- ☐ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No (please specify)

Where were the data collected?

e.g. school, home.

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Unclear/not stated (please specify)
- School

Are there other important features of data collection?

e.g. use of video or audio tape; ethical issues such as confidentiality etc.

- ☐ Details

Methods - Data analysis

Which methods were used to analyse the data?

Please give details e.g. for in-depth interviews, how were the data handled? Details of statistical analysis can be given next.

- ☒ Explicitly stated (please specify)
- ☐ Implicit (please specify)
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Which statistical methods, if any, were used in the analysis?

- ☐ Details
- All analyses were conducted using Mplus 7.3
- We used structural equation modeling with complex sampling and the Maximum Likelihood Robust (MLR) approach implemented in Mplus to deal with clustered data and a model that contained continuous non-normally distributed variables
- All classes smaller than three students were excluded from the analysis (seven classes, 15 participants) and 14 students were excluded due to missing values in at least one of the measured variables

- moderated multiple mediation with one latent variable (working memory capacity) in the structural equation modelling approach was conducted to examine intellectual helplessness and FAWMT as potential mediators of the association between chronic stereotype threat and mathematical achievement
- We used 95% CI method to determine significance of indirect effects
- All structural models were evaluated using fit indices following Kline's (2011) recommendations. We used Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) as well as the general fit based on χ^2 test of model fit and its associated probability (p). We used the most widely recommended cut-off values indicative of an adequate model fit to the data, respectively: RMSEA and SRMR < 0.06 and < 0.08, CFI and TLI < 0.95 and < 0.90 (Lance et al., 2006).

What rationale do the authors give for the methods of analysis for the study?

e.g. for their methods of sampling, data collection, or analysis.

☐ Details

For evaluation studies that use prospective allocation, please specify the basis on which data analysis was carried out.

'Intention to intervene' means that data were analysed on the basis of the original number of participants as recruited into the different groups. 'Intervention received' means data were analysed on the basis of the number of participants actually receiving the intervention.

- ☐ Not applicable (not an evaluation study with prospective allocation)
- ☐ 'Intention to intervene'
- ☐ 'Intervention received'
- ☐ Not stated/unclear (please specify)

Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability of data analysis?

e.g. using more than one researcher to analyse data, looking for negative cases.

☐ Details

Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity of data analysis?

e.g. internal or external consistency; checking results with participants.

☐ Details

Do the authors describe strategies used in the analysis to control for bias from confounding variables?

☐ Details

Please describe any other important features of the analysis.

☐ Details

Please comment on any other analytic or statistical issues if relevant.

☐ Details

Results and Conclusions

How are the results of the study presented?

e.g. as quotations/figures within text, in tables, appendices.

☐ Details

- tables
- figure
- in text

What are the results of the study as reported by authors?

Please give details and refer to page numbers in the report(s) of the study where necessary (e.g. for key tables).

☐ Details

Descriptive Analysis: - Relation between variables included in the model and the associated descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1 - Mathematical achievement was negatively correlated with stereotype threat and intellectual helplessness, and positively correlated with all three functional aspects of working memory. - Stereotype threat was only mildly correlated with intellectual helplessness.

Multiple Mediators Model With FAWMT and Intellectual Helplessness as Mediators

Evaluation of the Model:

- achieved a good fit to the data, see Fig. 1 - The general test of fit was significant, showing a mediocre general fit, the inspection of the fit indices values presented a good fit - Model explained 39.8% of mathematical achievement variability, 19.1% of the abstract working memory effectiveness, and 5.5% of helplessness - Data indicates that the majority of the relationships between the variables is consistent with the hypotheses. - Helplessness was negatively associated and FAWMT positively associated with mathematical achievement - There was a significant relation between FAWMT and its predictors: helplessness, gender identity, and the interaction of chronic stereotype threat and gender identity - The interaction term (chronic stereotype threat by gender identity) was a significant predictor of helplessness - These results confirm that the relationship between stereotype threat and working memory is moderated by gender identity as well as the relationship between stereotype threat and helplessness - This also indicates that learned helplessness is a moderate, but significant, predictor of FAWMT - The analysis of the significance of path coefficients revealed that the rest of associations (mostly direct paths) were not significant

Indirect Effects of Helplessness and FAWMT as Mediators: - Three models with indirect effects were evaluated: (1) stereotype threat on mathematical performance mediated by only helplessness, (2) stereotype threat on mathematical performance mediated only by FAWMT, (3) stereotype threat on mathematical performance mediated by sequence of both mediators: learned helplessness and working memory - To test the role of gender identity as a moderator, all models were calculated for a low, medium, and high level of gender identity - The results indicate that the potential mediators operated in parallel but not sequential - two mediators were revealed as significant: mediation by helplessness and mediation by FAWMT - Sequential mediation through both helplessness and working memory was not significant - All mediators worked only for participants with a high level of gender identity - None of the mediators was significant when gender identity was medium or low.

Was the precision of the estimate of the intervention or treatment effect reported?

- CONSIDER:
 - Were confidence intervals (CIs) reported?
- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Are there any obvious shortcomings in the reporting of the data?

- ☐ Yes (please specify)
- ☒ No

Do the authors report on all variables they aimed to study as specified in their aims/research questions?

This excludes variables just used to describe the sample.

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No

Do the authors state where the full original data are stored?

- ☐ Yes (please specify)
- ☒ No

What do the author(s) conclude about the findings of the study?

Please give details and refer to page numbers in the report of the study where necessary.

- ☐ Details

Firstly, our results revealed that chronic stereotype threat is related to the lower effectiveness of working memory functions and in turn to the lower mathematical achievement but only in schoolgirls highly identified with their gender group. We found a general pattern of chronic stereotype threat corresponding to low mathematical achievement as measured by school grades.

Additionally, we showed that the negative relation between school achievement and stereotype threat is mediated by three functional aspects of working memory: simultaneous storage and processing, supervision, and relational integration. By including working memory capacity as a mediator and group identity as moderator of chronic stereotype threat we have successfully verified the model of acute stereotype threat proposed by Schmader et al. (2008).

We demonstrated that repeated exposure to stereotype threat, leading to chronic stereotype threat, may also cause a persistent depletion of working memory.

Secondly, we observed that for participants with a strong gender identification, a higher level of chronic stereotype threat is associated with a higher level of learned helplessness and in turn with a lower mathematical achievement. In essence, the relation between chronic stereotype threat and achievement was mediated by learned helplessness.

Thirdly, the purpose of this work was also to examine chronic stereotype threat effects in secondary schoolgirls sample and test gender identification as a moderator of chronic stereotype threat effects. We found that the link between chronic stereotype threat and cognitive deficits was present only in the case of highly identified girls.

Quality of the study - Reporting

Is the context of the study adequately described?

Consider your answer to questions: Why was this study done at this point in time, in those contexts and with those people or institutions? (Section B question 2) Was the study informed by or linked to an existing body of empirical and/or theoretical research? (Section B question 3) Which of the following groups were consulted in working out the aims to be addressed in the study? (Section B question 4) Do the authors report how the study was funded? (Section B question 5) When was the study carried out? (Section B question 6)

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No (please specify)

Are the aims of the study clearly reported?

Consider your answer to questions: What are the broad aims of the study? (Section B question 1) What are the study research questions and/or hypotheses? (Section C question 10)

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No (please specify)

Is there an adequate description of the sample used in the study and how the sample was identified and recruited?

Consider your answer to all questions in Methods on 'Sampling Strategy', 'Recruitment and Consent', and 'Actual Sample'.

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
- ☐ No (please specify)

Is there an adequate description of the methods used in the study to collect data?

Consider your answer to the following questions in Section I: Which methods were used to collect the data? Details of data collection methods or tools Who collected the data? Do the authors describe the setting where the data were collected? Are there other important features of the data collection procedures?

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

Is there an adequate description of the methods of data analysis?

Consider your answer to the following questions in Section J: Which methods were used to analyse the data? What statistical methods, if any, were used in the analysis? Who carried out the data analysis?

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

Is the study replicable from this report?

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

Do the authors avoid selective reporting bias?

(e.g. do they report on all variables they aimed to study as specified in their aims/research questions?)

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

Quality of the study - Methods and data

Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done?

Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.

- ☐ Yes, some concerns (please specify)
☒ No concerns

Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study?

- ☒ Yes, a lot (please specify)
☐ Yes, a little (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was?

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?

- ☒ Yes (please specify)
☐ No (please specify)

To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study?

e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to or otherwise received the factor being evaluated concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result? e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and if applicable similar between different groups?

- ☐ A lot (please specify)
☒ A little (please specify)
☐ Not at all (please specify)

How generalisable are the study results?

- ☐ Details
- towards the targeted population -> secondary school female pupils

Weight of evidence - A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)?

In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases please code the trustworthiness of this combined results/conclusion. Please remember to complete the weight of evidence questions B-D which are in your review specific data extraction guidelines.

- ☐ High trustworthiness (please specify)
☒ Medium trustworthiness (please specify)
☐ Low trustworthiness (please specify)

Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings so that the conclusions are trustworthy?

- ☐ Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable)
☐ High trustworthiness
☒ Medium trustworthiness
☐ Low trustworthiness

Wells et al. (2014)

CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for

Comparability.

Selection

Is the case definition adequate?

- a) yes, with independent validation
- b) yes, e.g., record linkage or based on self reports
- c) no description

Representativeness of the cases

- a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases *
- b) potential for selection biases or not stated

Selection of Controls

- a) community controls *
- b) hospital controls
- c) no description

Definition of Controls

- a) no history of disease (endpoint) *
- b) no description of source

Comparability

Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) study controls for _____ (Select the most important factor.)
*
- b) study controls for any additional factor * (This criterion could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

Exposure

Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (e.g., surgical records) *
- b) structured interview where blind to case/control status *
- c) interview not blinded to case/control status
- d) written self report or medical record only
- e) no description

Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls

- a) yes *
- b) no

Non-Response rate

- a) same rate for both groups *
 - b) non respondents described
 - c) rate different and no designation
-

COHORT STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

Selection***Representativeness of the exposed cohort***

- a) truly representative of the average _____ (describe) in the community *
- b) somewhat representative of the average _____ in the community *
- c) selected group of users, e.g., nurses, volunteers
- d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

Selection of the non exposed cohort

- a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort *
- b) drawn from a different source
- c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (e.g., surgical records) *
- b) structured interview *
- c) written self report
- d) no description

Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

- a) yes *
- b) no

Comparability***Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis***

- a) study controls for _____ (select the most important factor) *
- b) study controls for any additional factor * (This criterion could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

Outcome***Assessment of outcome***

- a) independent blind assessment *
- b) record linkage *
- c) self report
- d) no description

Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur

- a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) *
- b) no

Adequacy of follow up of cohorts

- a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for *
- b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > _____ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) *
- c) follow up rate < _____ % (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost
- d) no statement

University of Glasgow (n.d.)

DOES THIS REVIEW ADDRESS A CLEAR QUESTION?***Did the review address a clearly focussed issue?***

- Was there enough information on:
 - The population studied
 - The intervention given
 - The outcomes considered

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ No

Did the authors look for the appropriate sort of papers?

- The 'best sort of studies' would:
 - Address the review's question
 - Have an appropriate study design

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ No

ARE THE RESULTS OF THIS REVIEW VALID?***Do you think the important, relevant studies were included?***

- Look for:
 - Which bibliographic databases were used

- Follow up from reference lists
- Personal contact with experts
- Search for unpublished as well as published studies
- Search for non-English language studies

- ☐ Yes
☐ Can't tell
☐ No

Did the review's authors do enough to assess the quality of the included studies?

- The authors need to consider the rigour of the studies they have identified. Lack of rigour may affect the studies results.

- ☐ Yes
☐ Can't tell
☐ No

If the results of the review have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?

- Consider whether:
 - The results were similar from study to study
 - The results of all the included studies are clearly displayed
 - The results of the different studies are similar
 - The reasons for any variations are discussed

- ☐ Yes
☐ Can't tell
☐ No

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

What is the overall result of the review?

- Consider:
 - If you are clear about the review's 'bottom line' results
 - What these are (numerically if appropriate)
 - How were the results expressed (NNT, odds ratio, etc)

How precise are the results?

- Are the results presented with confidence intervals?

- ☐ Yes
☐ Can't tell
☐ No

WILL THE RESULTS HELP LOCALLY?

Can the results be applied to the local population?

- Consider whether:
 - The patients covered by the review could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern

– Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the review

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ No

Were all important outcomes considered?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ No

Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?

- Even if this is not addressed by the review, what do you think?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ No

References

- Bedyńska, S., Krejtz, I., & Sedek, G. (2018). Chronic stereotype threat is associated with mathematical achievement on representative sample of secondary schoolgirls: The role of gender identification, working memory, and intellectual helplessness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 428. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00428>
- Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. (2018). CASP Systematic Review Checklist [Organization]. In *CASP - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme*. <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>.
- EPPI-Centre. (2003). *Review guidelines for extracting data and quality assessing primary studies in educational research* (Guidelines Version 0.9.7). Social Science Research Unit. University of Glasgow. (n.d.). *Critical appraisal checklist for a systematic review* [Checklist]. Department of General Practice, University of Glasgow.
- Wells, G., Shea, B., O'Connell, D., Robertson, J., Welch, V., Losos, M., & Tugwell, P. (2014). The newcastle-ottawa scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. *Ottawa Health Research Institute Web Site*, 7.