# Using apa7 and flextable to Recreate Tables from Recent APA Journal Articles

## Recreating Table 5 from Wilmot et al. ([2025](#ref-wilmotMappingDomainsLife2025))

Table 1

Summary of Results of Content Validation for Life Success Categories

| Categorya | *Nv* | *psa* | |  | *csv* | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Individual | | | | | | |
| Psychological health | 20 | 0.79 | 0.15 |  | 0.59 | 0.27 |
| Physical health | 8 | 0.97 | 0.03 |  | 0.94 | 0.07 |
| Longevity | 13 | 0.93 | 0.05 |  | 0.85 | 0.10 |
| Interpersonal | | | | | | |
| Interpersonal relations | 6 | 0.80 | 0.15 |  | 0.59 | 0.30 |
| Social environment | 15 | 0.85 | 0.15 |  | 0.69 | 0.29 |
| Societal attitudes | 11 | 0.79 | 0.11 |  | 0.57 | 0.21 |
| Collaboration | 21 | 0.73 | 0.11 |  | 0.46 | 0.22 |
| Leadership | 9 | 0.80 | 0.19 |  | 0.61 | 0.39 |
| Family formation | 4 | 0.98 | 0.01 |  | 0.96 | 0.03 |
| Institutional | | | | | | |
| Institutional adjustment | 10 | 0.70 | 0.11 |  | 0.40 | 0.21 |
| Task environment | 8 | 0.91 | 0.09 |  | 0.82 | 0.18 |
| Work attitudes | 14 | 0.82 | 0.15 |  | 0.64 | 0.30 |
| Performance | 50 | 0.82 | 0.14 |  | 0.63 | 0.27 |
| Extrinsic rewards | 15 | 0.69 | 0.14 |  | 0.38 | 0.22 |
| *Note*. *Nv* = number of variables sorted into each life success category. To quantify agreement among raters, we computed two indices: *proportion of substantive agreement* (*psa*) and *substantive validity coefficient* (*csv*); *psa* ranges from 0 to 1, with 1 attained in the presence of unanimous agreement; *csv* ranges from −1 to 1; the minimum occurs when all raters unanimously misclassify an item, whereas the maximum occurs when all raters unanimously agree on its classification. In evaluating *psa* and *csv* values, we used benchmarks of Colquitt et al. (2019), which indicate that *psa* ≥ .72 and *csv* ≥ .51 reflect moderate or stronger agreement; italicized values indicate weaker agreement (*psa* = .40–.71 and *csv* = .05–.50). | | | | | | |
| a*Nv* = 14 variables were judged as fitting into multiple categories and were subsequently submitted to subject matter expert review. Based on 80% agreement and justification from the scholarly literature, variables were ultimately ceded to their best fitting life success category. | | | | | | |

*Note*. *Nv* = number of variables sorted into each life success category. To quantify agreement among raters, we computed two indices: *proportion of substantive agreement* (*psa*) and *substantive validity coefficient* (*csv*); *psa* ranges from 0 to 1, with 1 attained in the presence of unanimous agreement; *csv* ranges from −1 to 1; the minimum occurs when all raters unanimously misclassify an item, whereas the maximum occurs when all raters unanimously agree on its classification. In evaluating *psa* and *csv* values, we used benchmarks of Colquitt et al. (2019), which indicate that *psa* ≥ .72 and *csv* ≥ .51 reflect moderate or stronger agreement; italicized values indicate weaker agreement (*psa* = .40–.71 and *csv* = .05–.50).

a*Nv* = 14 variables were judged as fitting into multiple categories and were subsequently submitted to subject matter expert review. Based on 80% agreement and justification from the scholarly literature, variables were ultimately ceded to their best fitting life success category.
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## Recreating Table from Fabiano et al. ([2025](#ref-fabianoRandomizedControlledTrial2025))

| Model | 1. DRC × Time → violation | | |  | 2. Moderator: Medication status | | |  | 3. Moderator: Grade | | |  | 4. Moderator: ODD | | |  | 5. Moderator: IEP | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| Intercept | 1.77 | 0.09 | <.001 |  | 1.84 | 0.13 | <.001 |  | 1.90 | 0.11 | <.001 |  | 1.70 | 0.12 | <.001 |  | 1.75 | 0.23 | <.001 |
| Obs | 0.00 | 0.01 | .867 |  | 0.00 | 0.01 | .943 |  | 0.00 | 0.01 | .897 |  | 0.00 | 0.01 | .995 |  | 0.00 | 0.01 | .971 |
| Time | −0.04 | 0.06 | .517 |  | −0.01 | 0.07 | .935 |  | 0.00 | 0.06 | .990 |  | −0.03 | 0.07 | .662 |  | 0.01 | 0.10 | .922 |
| DRC | 0.31 | 0.13 | .013 |  | 0.32 | 0.18 | .072 |  | 0.25 | 0.16 | .132 |  | 0.15 | 0.18 | .383 |  | 0.46 | 0.34 | .183 |
| Mod |  |  |  |  | −0.15 | 0.18 | .396 |  | −0.31 | 0.18 | .076 |  | 0.12 | 0.17 | .464 |  | 0.07 | 0.39 | .858 |
| Time × DRC | −0.13 | 0.05 | .012 |  | −0.01 | 0.08 | .912 |  | −0.11 | 0.07 | .112 |  | −0.01 | 0.08 | .906 |  | −0.35 | 0.12 | .003 |
| Time × Mod |  |  |  |  | −0.07 | 0.08 | .438 |  | −0.10 | 0.08 | .182 |  | −0.02 | 0.08 | .769 |  | −0.13 | 0.17 | .453 |
| DRC × Mod |  |  |  |  | −0.01 | 0.25 | .974 |  | 0.17 | 0.25 | .514 |  | 0.38 | 0.25 | .125 |  | −0.28 | 0.56 | .622 |
| Time × DRC × Mod |  |  |  |  | −0.20 | 0.11 | .073 |  | −0.07 | 0.12 | .548 |  | −0.20 | 0.11 | .082 |  | 0.45 | 0.22 | .043 |

Segal et al. ([2025](#ref-segalRandomizedControlledTrial2025))

| Baseline characteristic | Radical acceptance (*n* = 43) | TIP (*n* = 44) | Control (*n* = 43) | Full sample (*N* = 130) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | 32.35 (8.36) | 32.8 (8.94) | 33 (7.25) | 37.86 (8.6) |
| Deployed Relative | | | | |
| Son | 1 (2.33%) | 1 (2.27%) | 0 (0.00%) | 2 (1.54%) |
| Brother | 1 (2.33%) | 2 (4.55%) | 2 (4.65%) | 5 (3.85%) |
| Spouse | 38 (88.37%) | 33 (75.00%) | 35 (81.40%) | 106 (81.54%) |
| More than one relative | 3 (6.98%) | 8 (18.18%) | 6 (13.95%) | 17 (13.08%) |
| Highest Educational Level | | | | |
| High School | 8 (18.60%) | 10 (22.73%) | 5 (11.63%) | 23 (17.69%) |
| Bachelor’s degree | 24 (55.81%) | 17 (38.64%) | 27 (62.79%) | 68 (52.31%) |
| Graduate’s degree | 11 (25.58%) | 17 (38.64%) | 11 (25.58%) | 39 (30.00%) |
| Income | | | | |
| Well below average | 10 (23.26%) | 6 (13.64%) | 11 (25.58%) | 27 (20.77%) |
| Below average | 15 (34.88%) | 12 (27.27%) | 10 (23.26%) | 37 (28.46%) |
| Average | 8 (18.60%) | 14 (31.82%) | 12 (27.91%) | 34 (26.15%) |
| Above average | 8 (18.60%) | 12 (27.27%) | 8 (18.60%) | 28 (21.54%) |
| Well above average | 2 (4.65%) | 0 (0.00%) | 2 (4.65%) | 4 (3.08%) |
| Marital Status | | | | |
| Single | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 1 (2.33%) | 1 (0.77%) |
| Married/partnered | 43 (100.00%) | 44 (100.00%) | 42 (97.67%) | 129 (99.23%) |
| Divorced/widowed | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| Other | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| Children | | | | |
| Yes | 26 (60.47%) | 26 (59.09%) | 26 (60.47%) | 78 (60.00%) |
| No | 17 (39.53%) | 18 (40.91%) | 17 (39.53%) | 52 (40.00%) |
| Number of children | 1.814 (1.82) | 1.636 (1.92) | 2.279 (2.58) | 2.577 (1.13) |
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