Sample Tables

The tables in this document demonstrate APA Style formatting for tables as described in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.).

The tables are labeled (e.g., sample correlation table) to assist users in understanding the formats. These labels would not appear in an actual paper.

For more information on tables, please see the [APA Style website](https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/tables-figures/basic-table-setup).

## Sample Demographic Characteristics Table

**Table 1**

*Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants at Baseline*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Baseline characteristic | Guided self-help | | Unguided self-help | | Wait-list control | | Full sample | |
| *n* | % | *n* | % | *n* | % | *n* | % |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 25 | 50 | 20 | 40 | 23 | 46 | 68 | 45.3 |
| Male | 25 | 50 | 30 | 60 | 27 | 54 | 82 | 54.7 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single | 13 | 26 | 11 | 22 | 17 | 34 | 41 | 27.3 |
| Married/partnered | 35 | 70 | 38 | 76 | 28 | 56 | 101 | 67.3 |
| Divorced/widowed | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4.0 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1.3 |
| Children a | 26 | 52 | 26 | 52 | 22 | 44 | 74 | 49.3 |
| Cohabitating | 37 | 74 | 36 | 72 | 26 | 52 | 99 | 66.0 |
| Highest educational level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle school | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1.3 |
| High school/some college | 22 | 44 | 17 | 34 | 13 | 26 | 52 | 34.7 |
| University or postgraduate degree | 27 | 54 | 30 | 60 | 32 | 64 | 89 | 59.3 |
| Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployed | 3 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 6.7 |
| Student | 8 | 16 | 7 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 12.0 |
| Employed | 30 | 60 | 29 | 58 | 40 | 80 | 99 | 66.0 |
| Self-employed | 9 | 18 | 7 | 14 | 5 | 10 | 21 | 14.0 |
| Retired | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.3 |
| Previous psychological treatment a | 17 | 34 | 18 | 36 | 24 | 48 | 59 | 39.3 |
| Previous psychotropic medication a | 6 | 12 | 13 | 26 | 11 | 22 | 30 | 20.0 |

*Note. N* = 150 (*n* = 50 for each condition). Participants were on average 39.5 years old (*SD* = 10.1), and participant age did not differ by condition.

a Reflects the number and percentage of participants answering “yes” to this question.

## Sample Results of Several *t* Tests Table

**Table 2**

*Results of Curve-Fitting Analysis Examining the Time Course of Fixations to the Target*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Logistic parameter | 9-year-olds | | 16-year-olds | | *t*(40) | *p* | Cohen’s *d* |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Maximum asymptote, proportion | .843 | .135 | .877 | .082 | 0.951 | .347 | 0.302 |
| Crossover, in ms | 759 | 87 | 694 | 42 | 2.877 | .006 | 0.840 |
| Slope, as change in proportion per ms | .001 | .0002 | .002 | .0002 | 2.635 | .012 | 2.078 |

*Note.* For each subject, the logistic function was fit to target fixations separately. The maximum asymptote is the asymptotic degree of looking at the end of the time course of fixations. The crossover point is the point in time the function crosses the midway point between peak and baseline. The slope represents the rate of change in the function measured at the crossover. Mean parameter values for each of the analyses are shown for the 9-year-olds (*n* = 24) and 16-year-olds (*n* = 18), as well as the results of *t* tests (assuming unequal variance) comparing the parameter estimates between the two ages.

## Sample Correlation Table

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | *n* | *M* | *SD* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Internal–external status a | 3,697 | 0.43 | 0.49 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Manager job performance | 2,134 | 3.14 | 0.62 | −.08\*\* | — |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Starting salary b | 3,697 | 1.01 | 0.27 | .45\*\* | −.01 | — |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Subsequent promotion | 3,697 | 0.33 | 0.47 | .08\*\* | −.07\*\* | .04\* | — |  |  |  |
| 5. Organizational tenure | 3,697 | 6.45 | 6.62 | −.29\*\* | .09\*\* | .01 | .09\*\* | — |  |  |
| 6. Unit service performance c | 3,505 | 85.00 | 6.98 | −.25\*\* | −.39\*\* | .24\*\* | .08\*\* | .01 | — |  |
| 7. Unit financial performance c | 694 | 42.61 | 5.86 | .00 | −.03 | .12\* | −.07 | −.02 | .16\*\* | — |

a 0 = internal hires and 1 = external hires.

b A linear transformation was performed on the starting salary values to maintain pay practice confidentiality. The standard deviation (0.27) can be interpreted as 27% of the average starting salary for all managers. Thus, ±1 *SD* includes a range of starting salaries from 73% (i.e., 1.00 – 0.27) to 127% (i.e., 1.00 + 0.27) of the average starting salaries for all managers.

c Values reflect the average across 3 years of data.

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

## Sample Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table

**Table 1**

*Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analyses of Variance in Psychological and Social Resources and Cognitive Appraisals*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Urban | | Rural | | *F*(1, 294) | η2 |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Self-esteem | 2.91 | 0.49 | 3.35 | 0.35 | 68.87\*\*\* | .19 |
| Social support | 4.22 | 1.50 | 5.56 | 1.20 | 62.60\*\*\* | .17 |
| Cognitive appraisals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Threat | 2.78 | 0.87 | 1.99 | 0.88 | 56.35\*\*\* | .20 |
| Challenge | 2.48 | 0.88 | 2.83 | 1.20 | 7.87\*\*\* | .03 |
| Self-efficacy | 2.65 | 0.79 | 3.53 | 0.92 | 56.35\*\*\* | .16 |

\*\*\**p* < .001.

## Sample Factor Analysis Table

**Table 1**

*Results From a Factor Analysis of the Parental Care and Tenderness (PCAT) Questionnaire*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PCAT item | Factor loading | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Factor 1: Tenderness—Positive |  |  |  |
| 20. You make a baby laugh over and over again by making silly faces. | **.86** | .04 | .01 |
| 22. A child blows you kisses to say goodbye. | **.85** | −.02 | −.01 |
| 16. A newborn baby curls its hand around your finger. | **.84** | −.06 | .00 |
| 19. You watch as a toddler takes their first step and tumbles gently back down. | **.77** | .05 | −.07 |
| 25. You see a father tossing his giggling baby up into the air as a game. | **.70** | .10 | −.03 |
| Factor 2: Liking |  |  |  |
| 5. I think that kids are annoying (R) | −.01 | **.95** | .06 |
| 8. I can’t stand how children whine all the time (R) | −.12 | **.83** | −.03 |
| 2. When I hear a child crying, my first thought is “shut up!” (R) | .04 | **.72** | .01 |
| 11. I don’t like to be around babies. (R) | .11 | **.70** | −.01 |
| 14. If I could, I would hire a nanny to take care of my children. (R) | .08 | **.58** | −.02 |
| Factor 3: Protection |  |  |  |
| 7. I would hurt anyone who was a threat to a child. | −.13 | −.02 | **.95** |
| 12. I would show no mercy to someone who was a danger to a child. | .00 | −.05 | **.74** |
| 15. I would use any means necessary to protect a child, even if I had to hurt others. | .06 | .08 | **.72** |
| 4. I would feel compelled to punish anyone who tried to harm a child. | .07 | .03 | **.68** |
| 9. I would sooner go to bed hungry than let a child go without food. | .46 | −.03 | **.36** |

*Note. N* = 307. The extraction method was principal axis factoring with an oblique (Promax with Kaiser Normalization) rotation. Factor loadings above .30 are in bold. Reverse-scored items are denoted with an (R). Adapted from “Individual Differences in Activation of the Parental Care Motivational System: Assessment, Prediction, and Implications,” by E. E. Buckels, A. T. Beall, M. K. Hofer, E. Y. Lin, Z. Zhou, and M. Schaller, 2015, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *108*(3), p. 501 (<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000023>). Copyright 2015 by the American Psychological Association.

## Sample Regression Table

**Table 3**

*Moderator Analysis: Types of Measurement and Study Year*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *p* |
| *LL* | *UL* |
| Fixed effects |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | .119 | .040 | .041 | .198 | .003 |
| Creativity measurement a | .097 | .028 | .042 | .153 | .001 |
| Academic achievement measurement b | −.039 | .018 | −.074 | −.004 | .03 |
| Study year c | .0002 | .001 | −.001 | .002 | .76 |
| Goal d | −.003 | .029 | −.060 | .054 | .91 |
| Published e | .054 | .030 | −.005 | .114 | .07 |
| Random effects |  |  |  |  |  |
| Within-study variance | .009 | .001 | .008 | .011 | <.001 |
| Between-study variance | .018 | .003 | .012 | .023 | <.001 |

*Note.* Number of studies = 120, number of effects = 782, total *N* = 52,578. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

a 0 = self-report, 1 = test. b 0 = test, 1 = grade point average. c Study year was grand centered. d 0 = other, 1 = yes. e 0 = no, 1 = yes.

## Sample Qualitative Table With Variable Descriptions

**Table 2**

*Master Narrative Voices: Struggle and Success and Emancipation*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Discourse and dimension | Example quote |
| Struggle and success a |  |
| Self-actualization as member of a larger gay community is the end goal of healthy sexual identity development, or “coming out” | “My path of gayness ... going from denial to saying, well this is it, and then the process of coming out, and the process of just sort of, looking around and seeing, well where do I stand in the world, and sort of having, uh, political feelings.” (Carl, age 50) |
| Maintaining healthy sexual identity entails vigilance against internalization of societal discrimination | “When I’m like thinking of criticisms of more mainstream gay culture, I try to ... make sure it’s coming from an appropriate place and not like a place of self-loathing.” (Patrick, age 20) |
| Emancipation b |  |
| Open exploration of an individually fluid sexual self is the goal of healthy sexual identity development | “[For heterosexuals] the man penetrates the female, whereas with gay people, I feel like there is this potential for really playing around with that model a lot, you know, and just experimenting and exploring.” (Orion, age 31) |
| Questioning discrete, monolithic categories of sexual identity | “LGBTQI, you know, and added on so many letters. Um, and it does start to raise the question about what the terms mean and whether ... any term can adequately be descriptive.” (Bill, age 50) |

a The struggle and success master narrative states that same-sex desire/behavior is a natural if relatively uncommon developmental variant distinguishable from heterosexuality. Healthy sexual development entails “coming out” as well as joining a larger gay community in a shared struggle to overcome societal discrimination and be socially recognized as normal.

b The emancipation master narrative states that discrete, monolithic, and mutually exclusive categories of homosexuality and heterosexuality are social constructions, conceptually suspect in their ability to fully capture the idiosyncrasies of sexual subjectivities, desires, and behaviors. This circumscription of sexual self within culturally contingent and hegemonic sexual identity categories must be resisted.

## Sample Mixed Methods Table

**Table 3**

*Integrated Results Matrix for the Effect of Topic Familiarity on Reliance on Author Expertise*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Quantitative results | Qualitative results | Example quote |
| When the topic was more familiar (climate change) and cards were more relevant, participants placed less value on author expertise. | When an assertion was considered to be more familiar and considered to be general knowledge, participants perceived less need to rely on author expertise. | Participant 144: “I feel that I know more about climate and there are several things on the climate cards that are obvious, and that if I sort of know it already, then the source is not so critical ... whereas with nuclear energy, I don’t know so much so then I’m maybe more interested in who says what.” |
| When the topic was less familiar (nuclear power) and cards were more relevant, participants placed more value on authors with higher expertise. | When an assertion was considered to be less familiar and not general knowledge, participants perceived more need to rely on author expertise. | Participant 3: “[Nuclear power], which I know much, much less about, I would back up my arguments more with what I trust from the professors.” |

*Note.* We integrated quantitative data (whether students selected a card about nuclear power or about climate change) and qualitative data (interviews with students) to provide a more comprehensive description of students’ card selections between the two topics.