**Supplementary Materials A: 110 Coded Studies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Authors | Year |
| Albaladejo Albaladejo, Coyle, & Roca de Larios | 2018 |
| Bao | 2015 |
| Boers, Dang, & Strong | 2017 |
| Boers, Demecheleer, Coxhead, & Webb | 2014 |
| Boers, Eyckmans, & Stengers | 2007 |
| Boers, Eyckmans, Kappel, Stengers, & Demecheleer | 2006 |
| Boers, Piquer Piriz, Stengers, & Eyckmans | 2009 |
| Busse, Cenoz, Dalmann, & Rogge | 2020 |
| Candry, Decloedt, & Eykmans | 2020 |
| Chang | 2007 |
| Chang | 2019 |
| Choi | 2017 |
| de la Fuente | 2002 |
| de la Fuente | 2006 |
| Dolean | 2014 |
| Elgort, Beliaeva, & Boers | 2020 |
| Eyckmans, Boers, Lindstromberg | 2016 |
| Farley, Ramonda, & Liu | 2012 |
| Feng & Webb | 2020 |
| File & Adams | 2010 |
| Folse | 2006 |
| Fukkink, Hulstijn, & Simis | 2005 |
| Gablasova | 2014 |
| Gass & Alverez Torres | 2005 |
| Hirschel & Fritz | 2013 |
| Huang & Lin | 2014 |
| Huang, Kim, & Christianson | 2019 |
| Hulstijn & Laufer | 2001 |
| Hummel | 2010 |
| Jin | 2020 |
| Kaplan\_Rakowski & Loranc-Paszylk | 2019 |
| Kasahara | 2011 |
| Khezrlou, Ellis, Sadeghi | 2017 |
| Kim | 2008 |
| Kim | 2008 |
| Kim | 2006 |
| Laufer & Rozovski-Roitblat | 2011 |
| Lee & Levine | 2020 |
| Lee & Lin | 2019 |
| Lee & Muncie | 2006 |
| Lee & Macaro | 2013 |
| Lee & Pulido | 2017 |
| Li & Tong | 2020 |
| Lu | 2013 |
| Malone | 2018 |
| Mancilla-Martinez | 2010 |
| Mizumoto & Takeuchi | 2009 |
| Moonen, de Graaf, Westhoff, & Brekelmans | 2014 |
| Morimoto & Loewen | 2007 |
| Moskovsky, Jiang, Libert, & Fagan | 2015 |
| Nakata | 2015a |
| Nakata | 2015b |
| Nakata | 2017 |
| Nakata & Suzuki | 2019 |
| Nakata & Webb | 2016 |
| Nassaji & Tian | 2010 |
| Nguyen & Boers | 2019 |
| Niu & Helms-Park | 2014 |
| Ong & Zhang | 2018 |
| Pattemore & Muñoz | 2020 |
| Perez | 2020 |
| Perez, Peters, & Desmet | 2015 |
| Peters | 2014 |
| Peters | 2020 |
| Peters & Webb | 2018 |
| Pham, Donovan, Dam, & Contant | 2018 |
| Puimège & Peters | 2020 |
| Rassaei | 2017 |
| Rassaei | 2020 |
| Reynolds & Shih | 2019 |
| Rodriguez & Sadoski | 2000 |
| Rogers & Cheung | 2020 |
| Rogers, Webb, Nakata | 2015 |
| Rott | 2007 |
| Rott, Williams, & Cameron | 2002 |
| Saeedakhtar, Bagerin, & Abdi | 2020 |
| Sagarra & Alba | 2006 |
| Saito | 2013 |
| Saito & Wu | 2014 |
| Schuetze | 2015 |
| Shen | 2010 |
| Shintani | 2011 |
| Shintani | 2012 |
| Shintani | 2013 |
| Showalter | 2020 |
| Serrano & Huang | 2018 |
| Strong & Boers | 2019 |
| Teng | 2020 |
| Tian & Macaro | 2012 |
| Toomer & Elgort | 2019 |
| Traxler & Nakatsukasa | 2020 |
| Tsai | 2020 |
| Tseng, Liu, & Chou | 2020 |
| Van Den Broek, Takashima, Segers, & Verhoeven | 2018 |
| Verspoor & Lowie | 2003 |
| Walters & Bozkurt | 2009 |
| Webb & Chang | 2016 |
| Webb | 2005 |
| Webb & Chang | 2015 |
| Webb & Kagimoto | 2009 |
| Webb, Newton, & Chang | 2013 |
| Wei | 2015 |
| Yan  | 2020 |
| Yang, Shintani, Li, & Zhang | 2017 |
| Yasuda | 2010 |
| Yilmaz & Yuksel | 2011 |
| Yu | 2009 |
| Zhang & Graham | 2020 |
| Zou | 2017 |
| Zyzik | 2011 |

**Supplementary Materials B: Spearman’s *ρ* Assumption Checks**

The following section contains the results of the assumption checks for the correlations presented in the report (both whole report pool and spilt samples by cluster check analyses). Consider the scatterplot in Figure B1, which illustrates an extreme example of monotonicity violation when a binary 1/0 variable is correlated with a ranked year variable. The scatterplot shows that the reports rated as “1” (i.e., *yes*) have a negative association from 2000 until 2005-2015 but then a negative from 2015 to 2000. This data violates the assumption of monotonicity because a line of fit decreases and then increases in value when connecting the data points. Alternatively, Figure B2 highlights a perfect monotonic association, whereby the reports published before 2010 were ranked “0” (i.e., *no*) and the reports published after 2010 were ranked “1” (i.e., *yes*). In this case the line of fit is monotonic because it maintains a positive association with no clear change of direction.



Figure B1. Extreme violation of monotonic assumption



B2. Perfect Monotonic Association.

Figures B3 through B5 display the relationships between and time and sample-size planning, time and random assignment, and time and multi-site sample use respectively. These scatterplots reveal no clear violation of the monotonicity assumption. The *ρ* coefficient in a general sense empirically assesses the assumption where *ρ* = 1 equates to a perfect monotonic association (Field, 2018) and thus the assumption is somewhat weak as highlighted by Glass (1965).

 

B3. Time and effect size-driven sample size planning



Figure B4. Time and random assignment



Figure B5. Time and Multi-Site Sample Use