

## protocol\_abstract\_screening\_20230501

This document outlines the protocol followed for abstract screening of the research products identified via EbscoHost and ProQuest. This protocol was used in the project referenced below.

Schaefer, M., Daries, M., & Wagner, R. (2023). *The within- and cross-language correlation between phonological awareness and reading in African contexts: a meta-analysis*. LDbase. <https://doi.org/10.33009/ldbase.1682958493.05e9>

### Include

1. Is the study an original research study (i.e. not a meta-analysis, review, or editor's commentary)?
2. Does the study have several child participants (i.e., not a case study)?
  - a. If the study reported teacher level data but also mentioned child reading achievement we included these studies. We would need to determine the relevance in full text screening.
3. Is the sample from a country in Africa? (see list of countries in Appendix A);
  - a. If the country was not explicitly stated in the title or abstract we opted to include the study for full text review.
  - b. When no country was mentioned but a country specific intervention was mentioned (e.g. HeadStart, Reading Recovery, Earobics, AIMSweb in the USA) then we excluded these studies.
  - c. When no country was mentioned, but a language was, we excluded when the language is not widely spoken in Africa, e.g. Spanish, Caribbean Creole.
  - d. When no country was mentioned but an area/state was (e.g., the Midwest) that sounded American, we excluded it,
4. Is the sample's age kindergarten/reception year/preschool/creche to Grade 3 or age 5 to 10? (children do not need to be schooled) NOTE: after the first author screened ~100 abstracts, the decision was made to be more inclusive in age -> - Is the sample's age kindergarten/reception year/preschool/creche to Grade 7 or age 5 to 14? (children do not need to be schooled) i.e. primary school age (but can be unschooled kids). Differences between the initially screened abstracts using the different criteria was resolved.
5. Was the study published from 2000 to 2023 (inclusive)?
6. Is phonological awareness **and/or** reading mentioned?
  - a. A study was included if the abstract mentioned reading even if phonological awareness was not mentioned. The full text was reviewed in the next step to determine the relevance of the paper.
  - b. Exclude listening comprehension.
7. Does the sample comprise typically developing individuals other than reading and language difficulties (e.g., not deaf or blind)?

We included studies that mentioned students at risk, or struggling readers.

- a. Some papers referred to children with cochlear implants. These papers were excluded.

**Exclude**

1. Meta-analysis, review, opinion
2. Qualitative research
3. Sample not from Africa
4. Average age of sample is under 5 or over 14 years old
5. Published before 2000 (i.e., 1999 and before)
6. Phonological awareness or reading not mentioned (technically - as long as reading was mentioned we included the study, even if PA was not mentioned)
7. Sample includes only atypically children

No constraints on language, and first or second language were used at this stage of review.

## Appendix A - List of Countries searched

Algeria
Angola
Benin
Botswana
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon
Cape Verde
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoros
Djibouti
Dr Congo
Egypt
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Eswatini
Ethiopia
Gabon
Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea Bissau
Ivory Coast
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Libya
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Mauritius
Morocco
Mozambique

Namibia
Niger
Nigeria
Republic Of The Congo
Rwanda
Sao Tome And Principe
Senegal
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Africa
South Sudan
Sudan
Tanzania
Togo
Tunisia
Uganda
Zambia
Zimbabwe