

I'm not a bot



Reliability: no Baremation: noYez Botello, 2013Arenas Reading Comprehension Assessment Questionnaire (2007)Texts 4: 2 literary and 2 scientific with 32 questions each and four answer optionsInter-judge validation Reliability: no Baremation: noFigueroa Romero et al., 2016Reading comprehension test by Violeta Tapia Mendieta and Maritza Silva Alejos35 minValidation: empirical validity: 0.58 Reliability: test-retest: 0.53 Baremation: yesThe literal level presents a mean proportion effect size of 56% (95% CI = 3972%; Figure 2). The variability between the different samples of the literal level of reading comprehension was significant (Q = 162.066, p < 0.001; I² = 96.3%). No moderating variable used in this research had a significant contribution to heterogeneity; type of measurement (p = 0.520), type of text (p = 0.114), type of text (p = 0.520), type of career (p = 0.235), and type of publication (p = 0.585). The high variability is explained by other factors not considered in this work, such as the characteristics of the students (cognitive abilities) or other issues. Forest plot of literal level.The inferential level presents a mean proportion effect size of 33% (95% CI = 1946%; Figure 3). The variability between the different samples of the inferential level of reading comprehension was significant (Q = 125.123, p < 0.001; I² = 95.2%). The type of measure (p = 0.011) and the type of text (p = 0.011) had a significant contribution to heterogeneity. The rest of the variables had no significance: type of test (p = 0.214), type of career (p = 0.449), and type of publication (p = 0.218). According to the type of measure, the proportion of students who have an optimal level in inferential administering a standardized test is 28.7% less than when a non-standardized test is administered. The type of measure reduces variability by 2.57% and explains the differences between the results of the studies at the inferential level. According to the type of text, the proportion of students who have an optimal level in inferential using an argumentative text is 28.7% less than when using another type of text. The type of text reduces the variability by 2.57% and explains the differences between the results of the studies at the inferential level. Forest plot of inferential level.The critical level has a mean effect size of the proportion of 22% (95% CI = 935%; Figure 4). The variability between the different samples of the critical level of reading comprehension was significant (Q = 627.044, p < 0.001; I² = 99.04%). No moderating variable used in this research had a significant contribution to heterogeneity; type of measurement (p = 0.575), type of text (p = 0.691), type of text (p = 0.575), type of career (p = 0.699), and type of publication (p = 0.293). The high variability is explained by other factors not considered in this work, such as the characteristics of the students (cognitive abilities). Forest plot of critical level.The organizational level presents a mean effect size of the proportion of 22% (95% CI = 637%; Figure 5). The variability between the different samples of the organizational level of reading comprehension was significant (Q = 1799.366, p < 0.001; I² = 99.67%). The type of test made a significant contribution to heterogeneity (p = 0.289). The other moderating variables were not significant in this research: type of measurement (p = 0.289), type of text (p = 0.289), type of career (p = 0.361), and type of publication (p = 0.371). Depending on the type of test, the proportion of students who have an optimal level in organizational with multiple-choices tests plus open questions is 37% higher than while using only multiple-choice tests. The type of text reduces the variability by 0.27% and explains the differences between the results of the studies at the organizational level. Forest plot of organizational level.Table 3 shows the difference between the estimated effect sizes and the significance. There is a larger proportion of students having an optimal level of reading comprehension at the literal level compared to the inferential, critical, and organizational level; an optimal level of reading comprehension at the inferential level vs. the critical and organizational level.Results of effect size comparison.X²DifferenceCIValue of pLiteral-Inferential110.96322.9%18.703526.9796%p < 0.0001Literal-Critical248.06133.6%25.599837.4372%p < 0.0001Literal-Organizational264.32034.6%30.624638.4088%p < 0.0001Inferential-Critical30.06310.7%6.86514.4727%p < 0.0001Inferential-Organizational36.36411.7%7.912515.4438%p < 0.0001Critical-Organizational0.3091%2.52514.5224%p = 0.5782This research uses two ways to verify the existence of bias independently of the sample size. Table 4 shows the results and there is no publication bias at any level of reading comprehension.Publication bias results.Fail-safe NValue of pRegression testValue of pLiteral3115.000