Training Materials for Inclusive Sample Reporting

Quantitative research examples

G. Chung et al. (2022)

Reference: Chung, J. M., Meijer, L., Zonneveld, R., Al Sawaf, Z., Alajak, K., Moopen, N., Rahim, H., Çiftçi, L., Alisic, E., Stellar, J. E., Mooren, T., Sleijpen, M., Tešanovic, T., Al Baker, H., Dali, R., Papadantonaki, M., Papakosta, N., Antink, M., Charisopoulou, S., … Laceulle, O. M. (2022). Lessons learned from conducting a study of emotions and positive personality change in Syrian origin young adults who have recently resettled in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Personality, 36*(4), 665–682. **https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070221081319**

Participants *(abbreviated)*

At the first assessment, participants included 168 Syrian origin young adults who were currently residing in the Netherlands (70% self-identified as male, 30% as female; *M*age = 28.1 years). Tables 1 and 2 include additional background data provided by our participants at the first assessment. The majority of our participants identified as Arab, as heterosexual, and with the religion of Islam. Additionally, more than half of our participants held a university degree. Moreover, nearly all of our participants had refugee status in the Netherlands, and the majority chose "unsafety because of the conflict in Syria" as a primary reason for leaving Syria. Furthermore, more than half of our participants reported living in another country for more than 3 months before coming to the Netherlands, and on average, participants had been in the Netherlands for 3 years (*M* = 36.5 months, SD = 15.73). It is interesting to note that 50% of the Syrian population in the Netherlands is between the ages of 18- and 35-years-old, that the majority are male, and that generally high levels of education (Refugee Work Netherlands, 2020).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for participant demographic characteristics.

Variable	Proportion of participants who chose this response
Ethnicity (*N* = 168)	
Arab	.792
Kurdish	.054
Assyrian	.048
Other	.042
I would rather not say	.036
Turkish	.018
Armenian	.012
Sexual Orientation (*N* = 167)	
Heterosexual	.844
Bisexual	.110
Homosexual	.048
Education level (*N* = 166)	
University	.524
High school	.193
Vocational school	.114
Other	.054
University of applied sciences	.048
Primary school	.048
Secondary school	.012
Doctoral degree	.006
Religious affiliation (*N* = 167)	
Islam	.575
None	.222
Christianity	.078
Other	.030
I would rather not say	.096

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for participant refugee background.

Variable	Proportion of participants who chose this response
Refugee status (*N* = 167)	
Status holder	.916
Asylum seeker	.078
I have a Dutch passport	.006
Reasons for leaving Syria (*N* = 166)	
Unsafety because of the conflict in Syria	.843
Unsafety because of my political beliefs	.536
Unsafety because of my religious beliefs	.331
Other	.187
Countries resided in for longer than 3 months (*N* = 168)	
Turkey	.192
Egypt	.092
Lebanon	.058
United Arab Emirates	.058
Greece	.042
Saudi Arabia	.025
Jordan	.017
Dubai	.017
Algeria	.008
Oman	.008
Qatar	.008
United States of America	.008
Family members left behind in Syria (*N* = 146)	
Sibling	.637
Mother	.548
Father	.473
Extended family	.192
Child	.055
Wife/husband/partner	.048
Family members present in the Netherlands (*N* = 126)	
Sibling	.683
Mother	.500
Extended family	.389
Father	.381
Wife/husband/partner	.349
Child	.238

- reports relevant intersecting identities (ethnicity, religion) in addition to Syrian origin, and other demographics (education, sexual identity), showing heterogeneity within the sample instead of assuming homogeneity among Syrian refugees (*Guideline 3*)
- very detailed information on several sample characteristics related to the main topic of the study (refugee status, immigration-related variables) (*Guideline 1*)
- uses tables to summarize additional details (*Guideline 5*)
- includes statistics on the population of interest, allowing the reader to compare with the sample statistics in the study concerning how representative and generalizable they are to this population (*Guideline 6*)

K. Nelson et al. (2018)

Nelson, S. C., Syed, M., Tran, A. G. T. T., Hu, A. W., & Lee, R. M. (2018). Pathways to ethnic-racial identity development and psychological adjustment: The differential associations of cultural socialization by parents and peers. *Developmental Psychology, 54*(11), 2166–2180. **https://doi-org/10.1037/dev0000597**

From the Participants and Procedure section [*only a part of what was described*]:

The demographics for this study are reported in Table 1. The sample was majority female at each wave of data collection (61–73%). Participants self-reported their ethnic-racial group in their own words, which were then coded by researchers, see Table 1.(...) Individuals identifying as Asian Americans made up the largest subsection of the sample at each of the four waves of data collection (40 –55%). The next largest ethnic-racial subsection at each wave identified as black or African American (15–25%). Individuals identifying as mixed race or multiple ethnicities made up 8 –20% of the sample. Individuals identifying as Latino and Latina made up 6 –12% of the sample and individuals identifying as White made up 2–10% of the sample. Individuals identifying as Native American, American Indian or an Alaskan Native made up 0.3–3% of the sample. Finally, individuals identifying as Middle Eastern ethnicity or race made up 0 –2% of the sample. Data were assessed for cohort effects but indicated no statistically significant differences in study variables or demographics among cohort years. Participants were excluded from the study if they indicated that they were adopted (5% of the sample in 2011, 3% in 2012, 2% in 2013, and 4% in 2014) or an international student (11% of the sample in 2011, 5% in 2012, 2% in 2013, and 4% in 2014) given the unique peer and family context and therefore socialization processes for these individuals. Additionally, individuals were excluded if their responses were insufficient to calculate demographic or study variables that were included in the analysis, see Table 1.

Table 1
Sample Characteristics by Cohort

Variable	2011	2012	2013	2014
N	127	312	257	238
% Male	27	39	33	30
Age Mean (*SD*)	18.24 (1.26)	18.03 (.52)	17.96 (.37)	17.99 (.46)
% Refugee	7	6	5	6
% Adopted*	5	3	2	4
% International students*	11	5	2	4
% Divorced parents	15	17	15	17
% in First year of college	95	99	98	99
% Living with parents or other relative	21	20	22	16
Ethnicity†				
% Black/African American	15	20	22	25
% Asian American	55	54	40	44
% Mixed Race/Multiple Ethnicities	13	14	20	8
% Latino/a	8	6	6	12
% Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native	3	.3	1	1
% White	2	5	6	10
% Middle Eastern	0	1	2	0

Note. Omnibus tests indicated no statistically significant differences in these variables across cohort years. † Coded from self-reported values, due to this participants could have indicated they were a minority in university records but self-identified as white on the survey. * indicates these individuals were excluded from further analysis.

- example of a longitudinal study reporting detailed demographics for multiple waves concisely, in a table (*Guideline 5*)
- includes not just race/ethnicity (the main focus of the study) but also important related and intersecting background characteristics such as refugee status, being adopted or an international student; in addition to other characteristics (family status) relevant to the study topic of socialization (*Guidelines 1 & 3*)
- includes a category for mixed race/ethnicity; and uses coded data from participants' own description of their race/ethnicity (*Guideline 2*)
- in addition to the summary in the table, also explains in the manuscript text which racial/ethnic groups were dominant in the sample (*Guideline 6*)
- reports and explains which backgrounds were excluded from the analysis (*Guideline 4*)

Guidelines and Examples for Writing an Effective Constraints on Generality Section

Examples

The Wisdom Researchers and the Elephant: An Integrative Model of Wise Behavior (Good example of: Rec 1, Rec 2)

Example: "Another important limitation of the integrative wisdom model concerns the question of its cultural generalizability. The model is based on wisdom conceptions developed by "Western" researchers and findings from studies in "Western," relatively individualistic societies. While we believe that the components of the model are also part of "Eastern" conceptions of wisdom (see, e.g., Ferrari & Alhosseini, 2019; Yang & Intezari, 2019), relative emphases may differ and/or some components may be missing from the model. One could argue that cultures as a whole differ in their levels of the different components of wisdom (e.g., Asadi et al., 2019; Atwijukire & Glück, 2020; Grossmann et al., 2012)—for example, that people in collectivistic cultures are, on average, higher on concern for others and lower on self-knowledge. While people from highly individualistic cultures become less self-focused as they develop wisdom, maybe people from highly collectivistic cultures become more aware of their personal strengths and needs. In that sense, wisdom might represent a largely culture-independent ideal of how human beings live a good life that manifests differently depending on the biological, environmental, social, and cultural conditions into which people are born" (Gluck & Weststrate, 2022).

Am I a Science Person? A Strong Science Identity Bolsters Minority Students' Sense of Belonging and Performance in College (Good example of: Rec 4, Rec 5)

Example: "One significant limitation is that the present work did not address issues of intersectionality. Indeed, identities are multifaceted, and individuals are simultaneously members of many groups (e.g., gender, racial, socio-economic). The role of each of these identities—and certainly their intersection—is incredibly important and necessitates further research. In the current studies, the primary reason for omission of intersectionality related to a lack of statistical power to make responsible comparisons between intersectional categories (e.g., only 16 students and 21 students in Studies 1 and 2, respectively, were doubly stigmatized [first-generation and non-White]). Thus, an important unanswered question is whether science ID differentially impacts such students or, more generally, whether science ID's effect varies as a function of intersectional identities. Given that this is one of the first studies to empirically examine the psychological mechanisms driving science ID's effect on performance, future work should aim to replicate the findings in other contexts. The present studies were implemented only in Introductory Biology which, at the current university, is comprised of majority Whites and women. Would the same results appear if the intervention was delivered in other science domains with different demographic profiles (see Binning & Unzueta, 2013; Murphy et al., 2007; Walton et al., 2015)? Substantial evidence reveals the presence of gender stereotypes in math (Nosek et al., 2002; Riegle-Crumb & King, 2010), where women may be at greater risk for stereotype threat than in the life-sciences. Here, science identity among women may be more important (Vincent-Ruz & Schunn, 2017)" (**Chen et al., 2020**).