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**Appendix 2: Examination of Publication Bias**

Due to the fact that studies reporting statistically significant findings or large effect sizes tend to be published, we have a concern about overestimation of the aggregated effect sizes resulting from the biased samples of studies (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). To assess publication bias in our data, we conducted the following two measures: fail-safe *N* and the trim-and-fill. First, the classic fail-safe *N* (Rosenthal, 1979) calculates how many missing studies with small effect sizes (effect size = zero) would be needed before the *p*-value for the observed mean effect became nonsignificant. The results show that we would need to retrieve 3,726 studies for the first posttest and 210 studies for the follow-up posttest to nullify the effect (alpha = .05), indicating that there would be less reason for any serious concern about publication bias. Second, we computed the trim-and-fill analysis (Duval & Tweedie, 2000a, 2000b) with the random-effects model that computes an unbiased estimate of the mean effect size by accounting for the number of missing studies in the current data set. The results show that the initial and adjusted values were not hugely different in the first posttest: *g =* 1.14, 95% CI [0.86, 1.41] => 1.22, 95% CI [0.94, 1.50] or in the follow-up posttest: *g* = 0.93, 95% CI [0.44, 1.42] => 1.11, 95% CI [0.64, 1.57], indicating no serious effect of publication bias on the current result. These findings from the two bias-detective measures suggest that there is less concern about publication bias in the current meta-analysis.
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