Table Etiquette

Examples from

American Sociological Review, Social Science Quarterly, and *Social Forces*

Sample Tables

- Table 1s
  - Define variables
  - Provide descriptive statistics
- Other tables
  - Correlation matrix
  - Regression results

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables in Models Predicting Vietnam War-Related Congressional Roll-Call Voting 1965 to 1973

Variable	Observations (Months)	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.	Data Source
Congressional Roll-Call Voting						
Roll-call counts	97	2.19	5.43	0	45	Rosenthal and Poole (1991); Poole and Rosenthal (1997)
Pro-peace votes	42	40.73	21.32	.23	93	Rosenthal and Poole (1991); Poole and Rosenthal (1997)
Anti-Vietnam War Protest Events, 1965 to 1973						
All events	97	10.61	13.69	0	90	*New York Times* (1965–1973)
Types of Events:						
Events with more than 10,000 participants	97	.38	.89	0	4	*New York Times* (1965–1973)
Events with violence by demonstrators	97	.96	2.20	0	15	*New York Times* (1965–1973)
Events with violence by police	97	1.00	2.20	0	14	*New York Times* (1965–1973)
Events with injuries	97	.75	1.60	0	9	*New York Times* (1965–1973)
Events with property damage	97	.64	1.55	0	10	*New York Times* (1965–1973)
Other Covariates						
U.S. military deaths in Vietnam	97	533.95	514.86	0	2,413	Vietnam War Memorial Fund
Call-ups in Selective Service	97	15,494.74	10,778.74	1,666.67	35,366.67	Selective Service System (1967–1974)
Conscientious objectors	97	2,850.66	1,205.19	1,616.00	5,456.5	Selective Service System (1967–1974)
Percentage of public believing war is a mistake	22	51.69	14.82	26.38	76.99	Gallup International, Inc. (1965–1973)
Published articles related to Vietnam	97	73.52	42.01	3	171	*Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*
Period Dummy Variables:						
January 1965 to October 1967 (Pentagon March) (t_1)			[Reference category]			
November 1967 to December 1968 (t_2)				0	1	
January 1969 (Nixon election) to May 1970 (Kent State) (t_3)				0	1	
June 1970 to December 1973 (t_4)				0	1	

Clear, numbered title

Double or bold header line

Panels labeled clearly

No Vertical Lines!

Bottom line

Table 2. Description of Additional Predictors for Regressions of Wages on Incarceration: NLSY, 1983 to 1998

Variable	Description	Year Measured
Race/ethnicity	Dummy variables for non-Hispanic blacks, and Hispanics.	1979
Human Capital		
Education	Years of schooling completed.	All years
Work experience	Cumulative mean of weeks per year spent in paid employment up to interview year.	All years
Cognitive ability	Percentile score on the Armed Forces Qualifying Test.	1980
Self-Control and Social Attachments		
Drug use	Dummy for those recently using marijuana, cocaine or other drugs (interpolated for missing years).	1984, 1988, 1992, 1994, and 1998
Married	Dummy for married respondents.	All years
Charged, under age 18	Dummy for those charged with an offense before age 18.	1980
Incarcerated, under age 18	Dummy for those sentenced to a correctional facility before age 18.	1980
Job and Labor Market Characteristics		
Enrolled	Dummy for school or college enrollment.	All years
Union	Dummy for union members or wages set by collective bargaining.	All years
Industry	Six category code: (1) construction and manufacturing (reference category), (2) agriculture and mining, (3) transport and utilities, (4) sales, (5) miscellaneous services, (6) professional, financial and public administration services.	All years
Public sector	Dummy for public sector employment.	All years
Urban	Dummy if county of residence is 50-100 percent urban.	All years
Unemployment	Local area unemployment rate coded from 6-category classification.	All years
Region	Four category code: (1) Northeast (reference category), (2) West, (3) South, and (4) Midwest.	All years

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Hourly Wage and Selected Independent Variables Used in the Regression Analyses: NLSY Men, 1990

Variable	Never Incarcerated	Not Yet Incarcerated	Currently or Previously Incarcerated
Whites			
Hourly wage (in dollars)	8.92	5.84	5.77
Age (in years)	29.40	28.65	28.88
Education (in years)	13.10	11.10	10.07
Work experience (in weeks)	40.55	41.10	26.16
Married	.58	.40	.36
Enrolled	.06	.05	.03
Drug use	.31	.55	.65
Union job	.16	.05	.06
Number of respondents	2,205	20	78
Blacks			
Hourly wage (in dollars)	7.01	4.92	5.33
Age (in years)	29.23	28.90	29.38
Education (in years)	12.56	11.26	11.10
Work experience (in weeks)	37.38	32.19	25.80
Married	.37	.18	.13
Enrolled	.04	.00	.03
Drug use	.28	.41	.27
Union job	.24	.14	.21
Number of respondents	780	49	97
Hispanics			
Hourly wage (in dollars)	8.03	6.18	5.33
Age (in years)	29.31	28.70	27.94
Education (in years)	12.04	10.73	10.69
Work experience (in weeks)	40.59	35.09	25.48
Married	.57	.30	.26
Enrolled	.06	.00	.00
Drug use	.27	.43	.46
Union job	.22	.19	.09
Number of respondents	597	23	35

Note: Statistics are not reported for the variables urban, industry, public sector, or region.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Employed Sample (Weighted), Ages 18 to 60, with Completed Education: SEIAR, 1991 to 1997

Variable	1991	1992	1994	1996	1997
Number of cases (beginning of year)	2,675	2,884	2,796	2,698	2,637
Age (mean)	38.7	38.4	38.9	39.0	39.1
Percent female	51.3	51.0	49.3	50.5	50.6
Percent Communist Party cadre	.6	.5	.5	.5	.6
Percent Communist Party rank-and-file	12.1	11.2	10.5	10.4	10.2
Education (Percentages)					
College degree	18.5	18.6	19.1	19.8	20.2
Specialized secondary	27.9	28.6	28.8	29.7	29.7
General secondary	20.2	20.2	20.3	20.8	21.2
Lower vocational	17.7	18.3	18.9	18.7	19.0
Less than secondary	15.8	14.4	13.0	11.1	9.8
Branch of Current Employer (Valid Percentages for Nonmissing Categories)					
Manufacturing	33.9	32.9	29.1	25.6	24.0
Extractive industry	1.8	1.7	1.2	.9	1.0
Agriculture	12.0	11.5	11.1	9.6	9.4
Construction	10.0	9.4	10.2	9.1	8.7
Transport/communications	8.7	8.6	9.0	9.3	9.8
Trade/catering	8.7	9.9	11.3	13.9	14.5
Housing/public services	3.7	3.6	4.0	4.5	4.5
Health/social services	5.2	5.3	5.4	6.3	6.8
Education/science	8.6	8.8	9.5	10.1	9.9
Culture/entertainment/sport	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.3
Credit/finance/insurance	.8	.8	1.1	1.5	1.6
Public administration	3.5	3.9	4.9	5.7	6.2
Other	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.4
Missing (total percentage,)	2.7	4.3	3.2	3.2	2.7
Property Type, Current Employer (Valid Percentages for Nonmissing Categories)					
State-owned firm (including partly privatized)	87.4	85.0	80.9	76.9	75.2
Privatized, worker-owned firm	1.9	2.3	5.0	5.3	5.3
New private firm	3.0	4.9	6.7	10.8	12.9
Collective farm	7.2	6.6	6.7	6.0	5.6
Other	.6	1.1	.8	1.1	1.1
Missing (total percentage,)	2.7	4.3	3.1	3.4	2.9
Mean firm size (ln)	5.3	5.2	5.0	4.8	4.7
Standard deviation of logged firm size	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0
Annual Transition Rates					
Job losses/layoffs	.010	.020	.029	.032	.035
Intrafirm shifts	.007	.011	.011	.014	.011
Extrafirm shifts	.039	.043	.056	.051	.055

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

	Mean or Proportion	Std. Dev.	Range
Focal variables			
Donated social support	3.188	.487	1–4
Received social support	3.264	.415	1–4
Neighborhood disadvantage	.001	.831	−1.508–3.974
Residential stability	.549	.124	.156–.825
Gender (female = 1)	.503	—	0–1
Race (black = 1)	.499	—	0–1
Control variables			
Age	75.586	6.502	65–101
Marital status[a]			
Married	.530	—	0–1
Widowed	.290	—	0–1
Divorced	.117	—	0–1
Family size	7.464	7.302	0–76
Years of education	4.410	1.705	1–6
Household income	5.689	3.136	1–11
Perceived neighborhood problems	1.366	.432	1–4
Residential tenure	24.749	14.775	1–90
Life events	1.535	1.326	0–7
Economic hardship	1.102	.263	1–3

(N=1,139)

[a] The reference category is never-married respondents.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics: Means (and Standard Deviations) on All Variables

	Total Sample	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
Education	4.06 (1.68)	4.18 (1.69) [ab]	3.72 (1.52) [ac]	3.33 (1.59) [bc]
Income	9.94 (3.95)	10.34 (3.70) [ab]	8.59 (4.12) [a]	8.86 (4.14) [b]
Gender (1 = male)	.49 (.50)	.50 (.50) [a]	.44 (.50) [a]	.49 (.50)
Age	45.40 (16.74)	47.43 (16.93) [ab]	40.49 (15.52) [ac]	37.43 (14.39) [bc]
Residence (1 = city)	.70 (.46)	.65 (.48) [ab]	.70 (.46) [ac]	.79 (.41) [bc]
Region (1 = south)	.35 (.48)	.32 (.47) [a]	.51 (.50) [ac]	.28 (.45) [c]
Safety (day)	1.36 (.61)	1.26 (.55) [ab]	1.56 (.68) [a]	1.63 (.77) [b]
Safety (night)	1.77 (.80)	1.66 (.75) [ab]	2.00 (.85) [a]	2.06 (.92) [b]
Neighborhood crime	1.96 (.78)	1.84 (.72) [ab]	2.27 (.86) [a]	2.19 (.88) [b]
Media exposure	2.97 (.73)	2.89 (.68) [ab]	3.25 (.79) [ac]	3.07 (.80) [bc]
Personal experience (1 = yes)	.15 (.36)	.05 (.22) [ab]	.50 (.50) [ac]	.32 (.47) [bc]
Vicarious experience (1 = yes)	.13 (.34)	.05 (.22) [ab]	.38 (.49) [ac]	.30 (.46) [bc]
Bias against individuals	5.19 (1.75)	4.70 (1.42) [ab]	6.59 (1.85) [ac]	5.94 (2.02) [bc]
Bias against neighborhoods	2.77 (1.12)	2.55 (1.09) [ab]	3.44 (.94) [ac]	3.16 (1.03) [bc]
Police prejudice	7.68 (2.47)	7.03 (2.19) [ab]	9.69 (2.17) [ac]	8.78 (2.49) [bc]
Racial profiling	3.16 (1.82)	2.67 (1.63) [ab]	4.75 (1.46) [ac]	3.99 (1.78) [bc]

[a] The white and black means are significantly different, $p < .05$.

[b] The white and Hispanic means are significantly different, $p < .05$.

[c] The black and Hispanic means are significantly different, $p < .05$.

TABLE 2: Sample Characteristics, Men and Women Aged 55-74

Work status in 1989	
Stopped work since 1986 (%)	13
Worked in neither 1986 nor 1989 (%)	55
Working part-time (%)	13
Working full-time (%)	19
Demographic characteristics	
Male (%)	43
White (%)	89
Age (median)	64 years
Married (%)	68
Human capital	
Education (median)	12 years
Excellent or good health (1989) (%)	70
Values and attitudes	
Frequency of attendance at religious services (median)	2-3 times per month
Attitude toward statement: "Older people should contribute community service when they no longer work" (median on a scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree)	Agree

Source: Microdata from Americans' Changing Lives survey. Study sample is restricted to those responding to both interviews (1986 and 1989).

Note: Statistics are based on weighted data.

TABLE 1: Means of Independent Variables (Cont'd)

For Savings	Mean	Std. Dev.
Social networks		
Lived with relatives on last migration trip	.579	.494
Lived with townspeople on last migration trip	.713	.453
Belonged to a social club in U.S.	.019	.135
Household resources		
Owned farmland prior to last migration trip	.113	.317
Owned a business prior to last migration trip	.116	.320
Owned a home prior to last migration trip	.511	.500
Family life cycle		
Married	.850	.358
Number of minors	2.748	2.251
Trip characteristics		
Previous migration experience (months)	57.968	71.100
Total number of migration trips	4.938	5.560
Wages during last trip	4.869	3.938
Settled in U.S.	.025	.157
Duration of last trip	1.223	2.464
Spouse on last migration trip	.090	.287
Kids on last migration trip	.132	.338
Total savings ($1000s)	1.005	1.183
Human capital		
Work experience	24.128	13.101
Education	5.172	3.967
Sending community characteristics		
Percentage earning 2x minimum wage	27.409	10.785
Percentage of female labor force in manufacturing	16.243	10.840
Percentage of male labor force in agriculture	.468	.180
Macroeconomic context		
Mexican inflation rate	31.655	23.315

TABLE 2

Correlations and Descriptive Statistics (N = 53)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Organic water pollution intensity, 1995	1										
Organic water pollution intensity, 1980	2	0.841									
GDP per capita (ln), 1980	3	−0.240	−0.398								
Manufacturing FDI/GDP, 1980	4	0.117	0.127	0.065							
Manufacturing FDI/GDP, 1980 × LDCs	5	0.457	0.425	−0.476	0.424						
Manufacturing FDI/GDP, 1980 × DCs	6	−0.239	−0.204	0.443	0.700	−0.351					
Domestic investment, 1980	7	−0.328	−0.481	0.150	−0.189	−0.264	0.013				
Manufacturing/GDP, 1980	8	−0.354	−0.474	0.369	−0.054	−0.210	0.110	0.228			
Exports/GDP (ln), 1980	9	0.106	0.046	0.253	0.224	−0.036	0.260	0.222	−0.240		
State environmentalism (residualized)	10	−0.278	−0.274	0.000	−0.018	−0.100	0.061	0.104	−0.071	0.028	
Democratization, 1980 (residualized)	11	−0.232	−0.135	0.000	−0.133	−0.320	0.115	−0.148	−0.145	0.001	0.419

	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Organic water pollution intensity, 1995	0.190	0.041	0.929	1.028	0.120	0.320
Organic water pollution intensity, 1980	0.184	0.036	0.807	1.513	0.110	0.310
GDP per capita (ln), 1980	8.492	0.931	−0.360	−0.940	6.310	9.830
Manufacturing FDI/GDP, 1980	0.025	0.024	2.000	6.140	0.0002	0.134
Manufacturing FDI/GDP, 1980 × LDCs	0.015	0.019	1.037	−0.202	0.000	0.060
Manufacturing FDI/GDP, 1980 × DCs	0.010	0.024	3.571	14.669	0.000	0.134
Domestic investment, 1980	24.564	6.556	−0.206	0.512	5.620	39.080
Manufacturing/GDP, 1980	19.339	6.484	0.797	1.119	7.810	40.580
Exports/GDP (ln), 1980	3.117	0.651	−0.866	0.486	1.430	4.500
State environmentalism (residualized)	0.000	0.771	−0.290	−0.740	−1.601	1.531
Democratization, 1980 (residualized)	0.000	9.776	−0.044	−0.765	−19.703	21.533

Table 4. Unstandardized Coefficients from the Regression of Log Hourly Wages on Incarceration, Main Effects Model: NLSY Men, 1983 to 1998

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.04** (.02)	.71** (.05)	2.23** (.09)	2.23** (.14)
Was incarcerated (P)	−.07** (.01)	−.19** (.02)	−.16** (.02)	−.16** (.02)
Now incarcerated (C)	−.23** (.02)	−.24** (.02)	−.23** (.02)	−.23** (.02)
Log age (A)	.42** (.02)	.50** (.02)	2.27** (.13)	2.05** (.21)
Education (E) × 10	.43** (.01)	.65** (.03)	−.05 (.05)	−.15 (.08)
Year (t)	—	—	−.11** (.01)	−.10** (.01)
(Education × year) × 100	—	—	.41** (.02)	.38** (.03)
Fixed effects	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sample	Full	Full	Full	At-risk
R^2	.34	.61	.62	.60
Number of observations	47,616	51,424	51,424	18,923
Number of respondents	4,953	5,438	5,438	2,092

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. Model 1 includes controls for juvenile contact with the criminal justice system, cognitive ability, race, and ethnicity. All models control for work experience, enrollment status, drug use, marital status, union membership, industry, and region. The full sample includes all respondents. The at-risk subsample includes respondents who report crime, delinquency or any inc[...] sults for control variables are reported in Appendix A.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ (two-tailed tests)

Controls only listed in note

TABLE 2

Unstandardized OLS Regression of Percent of Black Enrollment in Charter Schools on District and Charter School Characteristics

	Model 1		Model 2	
District Race Characteristics	Coef	SE[a]	Coef	SE[a]
District Segregation	0.08	0.04*	0.07	0.04+
Legislation				
Race Legislation for CS	5.03	2.01*	5.42	2.02**
Controls: District/State Characteristics				
Percent Black in District	0.84	0.04**	0.80	0.04**
District Test Scores			−0.03	0.05
Region (ref = Northeast)				
Midwest	−5.60	3.83	−1.67	2.87
South	−3.52	3.92	−9.32	2.48**
West	−13.63	3.39**	−0.03	0.05
Urban School District (Metro)			5.98	2.11**
Controls: Charter School Characteristics				
Charter School Curriculum				
Special Curricular Focus			−2.22	2.07
Special Education			−14.09	7.09*
Technical Education			−2.91	9.21
Alternative Education			−1.47	2.18
Age of Charter School			−1.59	0.64*
Elementary CS (ref: Middle School and High School)			2.80	1.99
Start-up Status (ref: converted public school)				
Newly Created School			7.01	1.84**
Converted Private School			4.36	3.33
Constant	12.00	3.30**	3.41	5.76
N	688		688	
Number of Clusters (districts)	338		338	
F	171.68		94.31	
R^2	0.57		0.59	

[a]Robust standard error reported.

**p ≤ 0.01, *p ≤ 0.05, +p ≤ 0.1 two-tailed.

Confidence Intervals for Regression Coefficients: Meta-table that summarizes many models

Coefficient, Maternal Orphans

Coefficient, Double Orphans

Coefficient, Orphans of Any Type

Coefficient, Paternal Orphans