

Sample Tables

Table 7.2 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	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
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
Cohabiting	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 post-graduate 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

use of
specific
note

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.

Table 7.3 Sample Properties of Study Variables Table**Table 1***Psychometric Properties for DLOPFQ Scales and Subscales*

Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	Cronbach's α
Identity total score	86.6	28.0	28–155	.94
Work Identity	41.6	13.3	16–76	.88
Social Identity	45.0	15.7	14–84	.91
Self-Directedness total score	91.2	26.5	34–151	.92
Work Self-Directedness	44.9	13.5	16–76	.85
Social Self-Directedness	46.3	14.3	17–80	.86
Empathy total score	101.8	15.8	48–139	.84
Work Empathy	49.9	8.2	20–72	.72
Social Empathy	51.9	8.6	28–76	.77
Intimacy total score	122.9	28.6	56–189	.91
Work Intimacy	61.7	14.3	28–94	.82
Social Intimacy	61.2	15.4	24–96	.86

Note. The *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.) Levels of Personality Functioning Questionnaire (DLOPFQ) we developed had four scales (Identity, Self-Directedness, Empathy, and Intimacy), each with subscales for the work and social domains.

Table 7.4 Sample Meta-Analysis Summary Table**Table 1***Sample and Task Information for Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis*

Study	Sample	Task
Barch et al. (2001)	14 with first-episode schizophrenia 12 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
Barch et al. (2008)	57 with chronic schizophrenia 37 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
Becker (2012)	49 with chronic schizophrenia 28 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
Braver et al. (1999)	16 with first-episode schizophrenia 16 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
Chung et al. (2011)	41 with chronic schizophrenia 27 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
Cohen et al. (1999)	53 with chronic schizophrenia	AX-CPT

Delawalla	Study	Sample	Task
	MacDonald & Carter (2003)	17 with chronic schizophrenia 17 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
Edwards et al.	Poppe et al. (2016)	47 with chronic schizophrenia 56 healthy control participants	DPX
Gold et al.	Reilly et al. (2017)	402 with chronic schizophrenia 304 bipolar with psychotic features 210 healthy control participants	DPX
Holmes et al.	Sheffield et al. (2014)	104 with chronic schizophrenia 132 healthy control participants	AX-CPT, DPX
Jones et al.	Todd et al. (2014)	33 with chronic schizophrenia 58 healthy control participants	AX-CPT
	Zhang et al. (2015)	339 with chronic schizophrenia 665 healthy control participants	DPX

headings
repeat on
second page
of table

Note. AX-CPT = AX-continuous performance task; DPX = dot-pattern expectancy task.

Table 7.5 Sample Summary of Complex Experimental Design Table**Table 1***Summary of Designs of Experiments 1–4*

Group	Preexposure 1	Preexposure 2	Conditioning	Test
Experiment 1				
Compound	A– X– Y–	AX– BY–	X+	X–
Compound novel	A– X– Y–	AX– BY–	Y+	Y–
Experiment 2				
Compound A	A– X– Y–	AX– BY–	A+	A–
Compound X	A– X– Y–	AX– BY–	X+	X–
Compound novel	A– X– Y–	AX– BY–	Y+	Y–
Experiment 3				
Compound	A– X– Y–	AX– Y–	X+	X–
Element	A– X– Y–	AX– Y–	Y+	Y–
Experiment 4				
Control			A+/Y+	A–/Y–
Element A	A– X– Y–	A– X– Y–	A+	A–
Element Y	A– X– Y–	A– X– Y–	Y+	Y–

Note. A, X, Y, and B = tone, clicker, steady light, and flashing light, respectively (counterbalanced), with the constraint that A and B are drawn from one modality and X and Y from another (counterbalanced); plus sign (+) = shock to floor of rat chamber; minus sign (–) = absence of shock.

Table 7.6 Sample Descriptive Statistics for Study Measures Table**Table 1***Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on Baseline Measures*

Scale	High BAS group	Moderate BAS group	<i>p</i>
BAS-T	46.17 (2.87)	37.99 (1.32)	<.001
SR	17.94 (1.88)	11.52 (1.84)	<.001
BDI	7.11 (6.50)	6.18 (6.09)	.254
ASRM	6.46 (4.01)	5.63 (3.69)	.109
M-SRM	11.05 (3.36)	11.76 (2.75)	.078

Parentetical values in a short table are easily read. In most tables, different indices should be presented in different rows or columns.

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses. BAS = Behavioral Activation System; BAS-T = Behavioral Activation System–Total scores from the Behavioral Inhibition System/Behavioral Activation System Scales; SR = Sensitivity to Reward scores from the Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory scores; ASRM = Altman Self-Rating Mania Scale scores; M-SRM = Modified Social Rhythm Metric Regularity scores.

Table 7.7 Sample Chi-Square Analysis Table**Table 1***Frequencies and Chi-Square Results for Belief Perseverance in Attitudes Toward Celebrities (N = 201)*

Source	Do not believe		Unsure		Believe		$\chi^2(2)$
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Media reports	17	8.46	140	69.65	44	21.89	124.75*
Family reports	47	23.38	106	52.74	48	23.88	34.06*
Friends' reports	42	20.90	112	55.72	47	23.38	45.52*
Caught by media	19	9.45	82	40.80	100	49.75	54.00*
Celebrity display of behavior	12	5.97	61	30.35	128	63.68	101.22*

* $p < .001$.**Table 7.8** 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		<i>t</i> (40)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
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

exact *p* values

Note. For each participant, 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 is the point in time when 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 the 16-year-olds ($n = 18$), as well as the results of *t* tests (assuming unequal variance) comparing the parameter estimates between the two ages.

Table 7.9 Sample a Priori or Post Hoc Comparisons Table**Table 3***Analyses for the Interaction of Professor Type and Timing of Response on Perceptions of Professor Traits*

Professor trait	End of semester professor type		Start of semester professor type		F ratio	p	η^2 exact p values
	Typical	Effective	Typical	Effective			
Dedicated	4.706 _b	4.789 _b	4.154 _c	5.000 _a	19.26	.001	.15
Easy to understand	3.059 _c	4.895 _a	3.231 _c	4.429 _b	5.01	.028	.03
Fair	4.000 _b	4.263 _b	3.731 _c	4.667 _a	5.75	.019	.06
Manipulative	1.471 _a	1.632 _a	1.731 _a	1.238 _a	3.92	.051	.05
Insensitive	2.059 _b	1.526 _c	2.538 _a	1.143 _c	8.12	.006	.06

Note. Means with different subscripts differ at the $p = .05$ level by Duncan's new multiple range test.

Table 7.10 Sample Correlation Table for One Sample**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**	—

^a0 = internal hires and 1 = external hires. ^bA 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. ^cValues reflect the average across 3 years of data.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7.11 Sample Correlation Table for Two Samples**Table 1***Intercorrelations for Study Variables Disaggregated by Gender*

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Grade point average	—	.49**	.35**	-.05
2. Academic self-concept	.35**	—	.36**	.02
3. Teacher trust	.49**	.35**	—	.20**
4. Age	.10	.21*	-.15	—

asterisks for
p values

Note. The results for the female sample ($n = 199$) are shown above the diagonal. The results for the male sample ($n = 120$) are shown below the diagonal.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7.12 Sample Analysis of Variance Table (Option 1)**Table 1**

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

Measure	Urban		Rural		$F(1, 294)$	η^2
	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

*** $p < .001$.

Table 7.13 Sample Analysis of Variance Table (Option 2)**Table 2***Means, Standard Deviations, and Two-Way ANOVA Statistics for Study Variables*

Variable	SMT		Control		ANOVA			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Effect	<i>F</i> ratio	<i>df</i>	η^2
Psychological strain								
Time 1	0.24	0.30	0.22	0.29	G	2.82	1,151	.02
Time 2	0.16	0.27	0.27	0.32	T	0.38	2,302	.00
Time 3	0.16	0.26	0.26	0.31	G \times T	4.64**	2,302	.03
Emotional exhaustion								
Time 1	2.82	1.47	2.50	1.25	G	0.32	1,151	.00
Time 2	2.55	1.31	2.47	1.28	T	6.59**	2,302	.04
Time 3	2.36	1.39	2.43	1.16	G \times T	3.89*	2,302	.03
Depersonalization								
Time 1	1.20	1.09	1.12	1.05	G	0.07	1,149	.00
Time 2	1.13	1.07	1.25	1.16	T	0.67	2,302	.00
Time 3	1.00	0.93	1.24	0.93	G \times T	3.04*	2,302	.02

Note. $N = 153$. ANOVA = analysis of variance; SMT = stress management training group; Control = wait-list control group; G = group; T = time.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7.14 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 (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.

use of bold
on factor
loadings

example copyright
attribution for an
adapted table when
permission is not
necessary

Table 7.15 Sample Regression Table, Without Confidence Intervals**Table 2***Regression Coefficients of Leader Sleep on Charismatic Leadership*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>
Constant	2.65**		.31	2.76		
Leader gender ^a	-.11	-.07	.16	-.09	-.06	.15
Leader sleep condition ^b				-.36**	-.24	.15
<i>R</i> ²	.09			.14		
ΔR^2	use of specific notes			.05*		

Note. *N* = 88. We examined the impact of leader sleep condition (control vs. sleep deprived) on ratings of charismatic leadership. In Model 1, we entered the control variables of gender and video length to predict leader charisma. In Model 2, we entered sleep condition as a predictor.

^a Male = 1, female = 2. ^b Control condition = 0, sleep-deprived condition = 1.

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

Table 7.16 Sample Regression Table, With Confidence Intervals in Brackets**Table 4***Regressions of Associations Between Marital Satisfaction and Average Levels of Marital Behavior*

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Angry behavior					
Actor					
H → H	-98.90	40.20	-2.46	.016	[-179.1, -18.7]
W → W	-87.11	30.87	-2.82	.006	[-148.7, -25.6]
Partner					
W → H	-76.18	39.43	-1.93	.057	[-154.8, 2.4]
H → W	-91.80	38.16	-2.41	.019	[-167.9, -15.7]
Disregard					
Actor					
H → H	-38.62	27.86	-1.39	.170	[-94.2, 16.9]
W → W	-47.54	26.99	-1.76	.082	[-101.4, 6.3]
Partner					
W → H	-82.81	32.01	-2.59	.012	[-146.6, -19.0]
H → W	-79.36	27.16	-2.92	.005	[-133.5, -25.2]
Distancing					
Actor					
H → H	-47.42	24.72	-1.92	.059	[-96.7, 1.9]
W → W	3.04	23.48	0.13	.897	[-43.8, 49.8]
Partner					
W → H	-0.05	23.91	0.00	.998	[-47.7, 47.6]
H → W	-53.50	24.47	-2.19	.032	[-102.3, -4.7]

Note. CI = confidence interval; H → H = husband-as-actor effect on the husband's own marital satisfaction; W → W = wife-as-actor effect on the wife's own marital satisfaction; W → H = wife-as-partner effect on the husband's satisfaction; H → W = husband-as-partner effect on the wife's satisfaction.

square brackets
around confidence
intervals

Table 7.17 Sample Regression Table, With Confidence Intervals in Separate Columns**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.

^a0 = self-report, 1 = test. ^b0 = test, 1 = grade point average. ^cStudy year was grand centered.

^d0 = other, 1 = yes. ^e0 = no, 1 = yes.

confidence
intervals in
separate
columns

Table 7.18 Sample Hierarchical Multiple Regression Table**Table 2***Hierarchical Regression Results for Well-Being*

Variable	B	95% CI for B		SE B	β	R ²	ΔR ²
		LL	UL				
Step 1						.11	.11***
Constant	4.37***	3.72	5.03	0.33			
Perceived social class	0.43***	0.19	0.68	0.12	.30***		
Generation level	−0.11	−0.27	0.04	0.08	−.12		
Step 2						.23	.13***
Constant	1.78	−0.39	3.95	1.10			
Perceived social class	0.40***	0.16	0.64	0.12	.28***		
Generation level	−0.02	−0.23	0.19	0.11	−.02		
Familismo	0.33**	0.07	0.60	0.14	.21**		
Acculturation	0.09	−0.31	0.48	0.20	.04		
Enculturation	0.29	−0.04	0.61	0.17	.19		
Mex Am margin	−0.23**	−0.45	−0.01	0.11	−.17**		
Step 3						.26	.03**
Constant	2.27**	0.08	4.45	1.11			
Perceived social class	0.45***	0.21	0.69	0.12	.31***		
Generation level	−0.01	−0.21	0.20	0.10	−.01		
Familismo	0.37*	0.10	0.63	0.13	.23*		
Acculturation	0.11	−0.28	0.50	0.20	.05		
Enculturation	0.35**	0.02	0.68	0.17	.24**		
Mex Am margin	−0.23**	−0.45	−0.02	0.11	−.17**		
Masculinity ideology	−0.05**	−0.10	−0.01	0.20	−.18**		

Note. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; familismo = the collective importance of family unity that emphasizes interdependence and solidarity; Mex Am margin = Mexican American marginalization.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 7.19 Sample Model Comparison Table**Table 1***Comparison of Fit Indices in Models Fitted to Simulated Data Across Longitudinal Mediation Model Types*

Model	χ^2			RMSEA			AIC	BIC	ΔAIC	ΔBIC
	Value	df	p	Value	95% CI	p				
Simplex lagged	63.3	28	<.001	.044	[.030, .059]	.72	13,479	13,658	—	—
Simplex contemporaneous	58.0	29	.001	.040	[.024, .054]	.87	13,472	13,646	-7	-12
Latent growth	65.0	33	<.001	.039	[.025, .053]	.90	13,471	13,627	-8	-31
Modified latent change	26.2	33	.79	.000	[.000, .020]	>.99	13,432	13,588	-47	-70

Note. AIC and BIC differences are relative to the simplex lagged model. RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval; AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion.

Table 7.20 Sample Multilevel Model Comparison Table**Table 2***Model Parameters and Goodness of Fit for Linear and Quadratic Changes in Emotions by Behavior Type*

Effect	Parameter	Positive emotions		Negative emotions	
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Fixed effects					
Status at posttest, π_{0i}					
Intercept	γ_{00}	3.60*** (0.06)	3.34*** (0.12)	1.59*** (0.05)	1.82*** (0.11)
Prosocial behavior	γ_{02}		0.39** (0.14)		-0.36** (0.13)
Self-focused behavior	γ_{03}		0.26 (0.17)		-0.16 (0.15)
Linear rate of change, π_{1i}					
Time	γ_{10}	-0.03 (.02)	-0.002 (0.05)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.04)
Prosocial behavior	γ_{11}		-0.06 (0.06)		0.02 (0.05)
Self-focused behavior	γ_{12}		0.001 (0.07)		-0.04 (0.06)
Quadratic rate of change, π_{2i}					
Time ²	γ_{20}	-0.02*** (0.01)	-0.001 (0.01)	0.02*** (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)
Prosocial behavior	γ_{21}		-0.03* (0.02)		0.01 (0.02)
Self-focused behavior	γ_{22}		-0.01 (0.02)		-0.01 (0.02)
Random effects					
Variance components					
Level 1	σ_e^2	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.51
Level 2	σ_0^2	1.34	1.31	1.02	1.00
	σ_1^2	0.040	0.040	.002	0.001
	σ_2^2	0.004	0.003	0.001	0.001
Goodness of fit					
Deviance		6,703.18	6,692.50	6,424.12	6,413.91
$\Delta\chi^2$			10.68 ^a		10.21
Δdf			6		6

Note. Standard errors are in parentheses. All *p* values in this table are two-tailed. In Model 1 (unconditional quadratic growth), the intercept parameter estimate (γ_{00}) represents the average positive or negative emotions score at posttest across the sample. In Model 2 (prosocial and self-focused behavior vs. control), the intercept parameter estimate (γ_{00}) represents the average positive or negative emotions score in the control condition at posttest, γ_{02} represents the difference at posttest between the prosocial behavior conditions and the control condition, and γ_{03} represents the difference at posttest between the self-focused behavior condition and the control condition. γ_{10} represents the average linear rate of change in the control condition, γ_{11} represents additional effects of prosocial behavior on linear rate of change, and γ_{12} represents additional effects of self-focused behavior on linear rate of change. Finally, γ_{20} represents the average quadratic rate of change in the control condition, γ_{21} represents additional effects of prosocial behavior on quadratic rate of change, and γ_{22} represents additional effects of self-focused behavior on quadratic rate of change. In all models, the intercept, linear slope (time), and quadratic slope (time²) were free to vary.

^a*p* ≤ .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Displaying values in parentheses sometimes saves space when they are not applicable to all portions of the table. In most tables, different indices should be presented in different rows or columns.

Table 7.21 Sample Confirmatory Factor Analysis Model Comparison Table**Table 2***Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for the Relationships Among Three Types of Intelligence*

Model	χ^2	df	NFI	CFI	RMSEA
A: One-intelligence model ^a	10,994.664***	1539	.296	.326	.115
B: Two-intelligences model ^b	10,091.236***	1538	.354	.390	.109
C: Three-intelligences model ^c	8,640.066***	1536	.447	.494	.100

Note. Structural equation modeling was used for the analysis. NFI = normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation.

^a In Model A, all 57 items of social intelligence, emotional intelligence, and cultural intelligence were loaded onto one factor. ^b In Model B, the 21 items of social intelligence were loaded onto one factor, and the 16 items of emotional intelligence and the 20 items of cultural intelligence were loaded onto another factor. ^c In Model C, the 21 items of social intelligence were loaded onto one factor, the 16 items of emotional intelligence were loaded onto a second factor, and the 20 items of cultural intelligence were loaded onto a third factor.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 7.22 Sample Qualitative Table With Variable Descriptions**Table 2***Master Narrative Voices: Struggle and Success and Emancipation*

Discourse and dimension	Example quote
Struggle and success	
Self-actualization as a 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	
Open exploration of an individually fluid sexual self is the goal of healthy sexual identity development	"[For heterosexuals] the man penetrates the woman, 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. It does start to raise the question about what the terms mean and whether . . . any term can adequately be descriptive." (Bill, age 50)

Table 7.23 Sample Qualitative Table Incorporating Quantitative Data**Table 1***Reasons Why Individuals Chose to Watch the Royal Wedding (N = 45)*

Reason for interest	Example quote	Frequency, n (%)
Royal family and its history	"I love all things British. I studied abroad in the U.K. I also watched the weddings of Charles & Diana and Andrew & Fergie. I watched Diana's funeral. Watching William & Kate get married seemed like the natural thing to do." "I find the royal family and their practices and traditions fascinating. I am a big fan of tradition in any capacity (graduation ceremonies, weddings, etc.) and enjoy watching traditions older than our own country (the U.S.)."	16 (35.6)
Fashion and pop culture	"When big pop culture things happen, I tend to want to watch so I'm 'in on it.' Also, when I was little my mom made us get up to watch Princess Diana get married, so it felt a little like tradition." "I was curious. Wanted to see her dress and how the other people who attended dressed. Like pomp and ceremony."	13 (28.9)
Fairy tales and love stories	"I watched his mom and dad get married, watched him grow up. Plus I love a fairy tale that comes true. I believe in love and romance." "I am a romantic and think this is a great love story."	11 (24.4)
To pass time/it was on TV	"I was at the airport and it was broadcasting on TV while I was waiting for my flight." "It was on CNN when I got up."	5 (11.1)

Table 7.24 Sample Mixed Methods Table**Table 3***Integrated Results Matrix for the Effect of Topic Familiarity on Reliance on Author Expertise*

Quantitative result	Qualitative result	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 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 author 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.