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**Reading Anxiety Meta – Coding Sheet**

**Notes to coders**

**If your coding does not fit in this format please contact Rachelle**

**Any field where they do not provide that information and thus you have nothing to enter, in those cases put NA. Don't leave those blank.**

**who coded this**

1. Rachelle
2. Cynthia
3. Maxine
4. Other

**General information**

**Study ID**

StudyID

put 0 in front. so 1 = 001

**Covidence ID**

this is the ID given to the study by covidence. Look in covidence for what this is

**Author name**

If there are 1-3 authors list all author's last names. if there are

AuthorName

more than 3 author then just list the first author et al.

just list the last names, in the same way you would a APA in text citation

YearPub

**Year of publication**

**Title**

**Study characteristics**

**Number of participants**

n size of the group we are reporting on

**Publication status**

1. published

PubStatus

1. unpublished

**(un)published in what form?**

1. published in a journal

HowPub

1. book chapter
2. dissertation/thesis
3. written manuscript but unpublished (e.g., preprints)
4. raw data unpublished
5. conference paper
6. Other

**study design**

1. correlational/non-experimental

studyDesign

1. experimental/intervention
2. not reported
3. Other

**Study location**

**Country in which the study conducted**

1. United States
2. UK
3. Canada
4. France
5. Australia
6. China
7. Turkey

Country

1. Indonesia
2. Brazil
3. Israel
4. Other

**Language of reading/RA**

1. English
2. Spanish
3. Russian
4. French
5. Chinese

Language

1. Turkish
2. Indonesian
3. Portuguese
4. Hebrew
5. Other

**sample demographics**

**average grade and age**

|  | **mean** | **range** | **SD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **age** |  | ageMean |  |
| **grade** |  |  |  |

**age group**

1. preschool
2. early elementary

ageGroup

1. late elementary
2. middle school
3. high school
4. young adult (college)
5. adult
6. Other

**gender**

make sure to put this as percentages, not counts

Boy

|  | **girls** | **boys** | **other** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **percentage** |  |  |  |

**race/ethnicity**

list these as percentages

|  | **White** | **Black/African American/African** | **Asian** | **Native American/Pacific Islander** | **Hispanic/Latin American** | **other** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **percentage** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**how do they describe the SES of their sample?**

**SES percentage**

|  | **low SES** | **middle SES** | **high SES** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **percentage** |  |  |  |

**SES average level**

1. low SES
2. middle SES
3. high SES
4. mixed SES
5. Other

**percentage with a learning disability**

If they don't list the percentage with a learning disability put NA. But if explicitly say that they excluded children with learning disabilities, put a zero.

LD

**percentage of struggling readers**

this includes those who are low readers, struggling readers, at risk readers, at risk for LD but undiagnosed.

LDorLow

This is a combo of if they had either LD or struggleREAD

struggleRead

**Measures**

**Measure reading anxiety**

**How create RA measure**

1. Existing measure

createRA

1. Created their own measure from scratch
2. Adapted existing measure

**What is the name of their RA measure?**

This is if they gave a name for the RA measure they used (this could be a measure they created themselves or a measure that they used unchanged from another study). There will be papers where a name is not provided, and in those cases say NA.

**If it was an adaptation of an existing RA measure, what was the original measure**

if they say they took a measure from a different study and then adapted that measure, put that name of the old measure and the citation for that measure here

|  | **name of old measure** | **citation for old measure** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **original measure** |  |  |

cronbachRA

**cronbach's alpha of the RA measure**

**number of items in RA measure**

RAnum

**who reported RA**

1. self-report

reportRA

1. teacher-report
2. parent-report
3. Other

**How was the final RA score calculated**

1. sum score
2. average score

calculateRA

1. factor score
2. Not reported
3. Other

**Direction of scoring. What does higher RA scores mean?**

1. higher reading anxiety
2. lower reading anxiety

**how was the RA measure administered?**

1. researcher read the questions

readRA

1. participant read the questions
2. not reported
3. Other

**Measure reading outcomes**

**for these list the zero before the decimal (e.g., 0.25)**

**If they give different N sizes for each correlation then report that. but if not then put the over all n size if it is assumed that is the N size of the correlation**

**Comprehension**

ReadDomain

Was the domain of read for each correlation.

Comp = comprehension

Fluency = fluency

Accuracy = accuracy

General = a general/overall reading measure without a intended domain.

LK = letter knowledge

|  | **measure of comprehension** | **correlation with RA** | **N size** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comp1** |  |  |  |
| **Comp2** |  |  |  |
| **Comp3** |  |  |  |
| **Comp4** |  |  |  |

**Reading fluency**

this also includes (reading rate)

ReadMeasure

The measure used to measure reading achievement for each correlation

|  | **measure of fluency** | **correlation with RA** | **N size** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fluency1** |  |  |  |
| **Fluency2** |  |  |  |
| **Fluency3** |  |  |  |
| **Fluency4** |  |  |  |

N

The sample size of each correlation

Corr

The correlation for each correlation

**Reading accuracy**

|  | **measure of accuracy** | **correlation with RA** | **N size** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accuracy1** |  |  |  |
| **Accuracy2** |  |  |  |
| **Accuracy3** |  |  |  |
| **Accuracy4** |  |  |  |

**Letter knowledge**

|  | **measure of LK** | **correlation with RA** | **N size** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LK1** |  |  |  |
| **LK2** |  |  |  |
| **LK3** |  |  |  |
| **LK4** |  |  |  |

**Other reading measures**

Some reading measures may not cleanly fit into the other reading categories. Put those here and describe what they did measure in reading.

This would include composite reading measures that include multiple reading constructs or maybe it's word reading but not cleanly fluency or accuracy.

this does not include reading-related measures that are not reading such as phonological awareness or self-perception of reading abilities

|  | **what area of reading measured** | **Measure of other reading** | **correlation with RA** | **N size** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OtherRead1** |  |  |  |  |
| **OtherRead2** |  |  |  |  |
| **OtherRead3** |  |  |  |  |
| **OtherRead4** |  |  |  |  |

**study quality**

Quality

1 for yes

0 for no

0.5 for partial

Quality score was the average across all 14 questions of quality

**Were hypotheses/aims/research questions explicitly stated?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Were participant inclusion/exclusion criteria stated?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was the participant recruitment strategy described?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was a justification/ rationale for the sample size provided?**

e.g. power analysis and was their sample size appropriate according to that power analysis?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**was data collection process described with sufficient detail for it to be replicated?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Were the data analysis techniques justified?**

(i.e., was the link between hypotheses/ aims /research questions and data analyses chosen explained)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Were operational definitions of variables provided?**

Specifically, do they define reading anxiety? This would be in the methods or intro

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Were the measures provided in the report?**

Specifically, did they provide the RA measure with all items? In supplemental materials or full text.

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was evidence provided for the validity of all the measures (or instrument) used?**

(e.g. cronbach's alpha) for both reading outcomes and RA measures

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was information provided about the person(s) who collected the data?**

(e.g., training, expertise, other demographic characteristics)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was information provided about the context (e.g., place) of data collection?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was information provided about the duration of data collection?**

how long did the testing session/survey/measure take to complete

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was the study sample described in terms of key demographic characteristics?**

is more information about demographics provided including and beyond age/grade, gender, SES, race, and at least one additional thing.

if all =yes

if 2 = partial

if 1 or less = no

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**Was discussion of findings confined to the population from which the sample was drawn?**

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Partial

**ending**

**was the N's different for any of the correlations than you notes at the start?**

List those here. For example: there was multiple groups or longitudinal or they listed N's for each correlation

**anything else to note?**

if there is anything that concerns you about your coding or you feel needs to be noted on this paper, please note that here

**Have you entered this in the excel tracker?**

Please once done put this study in the following excel for tracking which studies have been coded. Also, put any further notes you have on the article you just coded in the following excel. Contact Rachelle with any notes of concern

1. Yes

**Thank you for your coding!**

**I appreciate you! - Rachelle**

**Other variables in dataset**

coder1

The correlation recorded by coder #1

coder2

The correlation recorded by coder #2

conflict

Yes = the two coders differed in what they extracted as the information from the study. In these cases, the two coders met and came to an agreement, but was left marked as Yes in the dataset.

No = coders did not differ