



Meta-Analytic Research on Concept Mapping

ES Meta-Analyses

- 0.79 Cambell, D. O., (2009). [A Meta -Analytical Review Of Novak's Concept Mapping](#). *Regent University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*.
- 0.59 Schroder, N. L., Nesbit, J. C., Anguiano, C. J., & Adesope, O. O. (2018). [Studying & Constructing Concept Maps: A Meta-Analysis](#). *Educational Psychology Review, 30*(2), 431-455.

An earlier review by some of the above authors, [Learning With Concept Maps: A Meta-Analysis](#) showed an effect size of 0.55. I did not include in this list, as the above research explicitly states it includes all primary research from their original meta-analysis.

- 0.45 Horton, P. B., McConney, A. A., Gallo, M., Woods, A. L., Senn, G. J. & Hamelin, D. (1993). [An Investigation Of The Effectiveness Of Concept Mapping As An Instructional Tool](#). *Science Education, 77*(1), 95-111.
- 0.75 Kyriakies, L., Christoforou, C., Charalambous. C. Y. (2013). [What Matters for Student Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Exploring Factors of Effective Teaching](#). *Teaching & Teacher Education, 36*, 143-152.

0.66 Average ES