

Individual findings of the meta-analysis at a glance

According to Schroeder et al. (2017): Studying and constructing concept maps: A meta-analysis.

Moderator variable	Moderator levels	Effect size g	Number of studies (k)
1. Constructing concept maps and studying existing concept maps ^[1]			
Comparison treatment	Discussion/lecture	1.05*	37
	Studied or constructed lists	0.43*	13
	Studied or constructed outlines	0.48*	8
	Studied text	0.29*	44
	Constructed text	0.39*	13
	Other	0.57*	27
Knowledge domain	STEM	0.60*	118
	Non-STEM	0.51*	23
	Not reported	0.05*	1
Concept map type	Animated	0.47*	7
	Interactive	0.60*	24
	Static	0.60*	105
	Mixed	0.35	6
Concept map use	Constructed	0.72*	75
	Studied	0.43*	67
Duration of concept map use	<1 week	0.36*	47
	1–4 weeks	0.68*	53
	>4 weeks	0.72*	41
	Unknown	0.06	1
2. a) Constructing the concept maps			
Region of the world	Africa	1.44*	7
	Asia	0.78*	9
	Europe	0.82*	9
	Middle East	0.75*	13
	USA or Canada	0.49*	33
	Other/not reported	0.62*	4
Knowledge domain	STEM	0.73*	64
	Non-STEM	0.62*	11
Concept map type	Static	0.72*	66
	Interactive	0.71*	8
	Mixed	0.75*	1
Comparison treatment	Discussion/lecture	1.05*	32
	Studied or constructed outline	0.40*	6
	Studied text	0.33	5
	Constructed text	0.48*	10
	Other	0.47*	22
Duration of concept map use	<1 week	0.40*	14
	1–4 weeks	0.94*	23
	>4 weeks	0.72*	37
	Unknown	0.06	1
Grade level	Intermediate	0.68*	22
	Secondary	0.74*	25
	Postsecondary and beyond	0.73*	28
Level of collaboration between learners	Individual	0.55*	32
	In groups	0.91*	14
	Mixed	0.91*	22
	Other	0.95	2
	Unknown	0.29	5

Individual findings of the meta-analysis at a glance

According to Schroeder et al. (2017): Studying and constructing concept maps: A meta-analysis.

Moderator variable	Moderator levels	Effect size g	Number of studies (k)
2. b) Studying existing concept maps			
Region of the world	Asia	1.04*	5
	Europe	0.46*	3
	Middle East	0.96*	2
	USA oder Canada	0.25*	51
	Other/not reported	1.29*	6
Knowledge domain	STEM	0.44*	54
	Non-STEM	0.41*	12
	Not reported	0.05	1
Concept map type	Static	0.40*	39
	Animated	0.47*	7
	Interactive	0.54*	16
	Mixed	0.27	5
Comparison Treatment	Discussion/lecture	1.09*	5
	Studied or constructed lists	0.43*	13
	Studied or constructed outline	0.72*	2
	Studied text	0.29*	39
	Constructed text	0.10	3
	Other	0.98*	5
Duration of concept map use	<1 week	0.34*	33
	1-4 weeks	0.48*	30
	>4 weeks	0.70*	4
Grade level	Intermediate	0.82*	7
	Secondary	1.24*	4
	Postsecondary and beyond	0.32*	56
Level of collaboration between learners	Individual	0.41*	55
	In groups	0.48*	10
	Other	0.75*	1
	Unknown	0.47*	1

[1] In *part 1* of the table, all existing studies are used to calculate an average effect size for the respective moderator level. In *part 2*, a distinction is made according to the form of application: In *2a*) only studies in which concept maps were constructed are used and in *2b*) only studies are used in which existing concept maps were studied.

* means that the difference between the condition with and without concept maps is significant ($p < 0.05$). For example, in the STEM *knowledge domain*, the effect of learning with concept maps compared to the group without concept maps is significant with a medium effect size (0.60).