

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023

Validating the Instrument, Egunjobi's Child Response Style Scale (CReSS)

Antoinette Nneka Opara and Joyzy Pius Egunjobi

Psycho-Spiritual Institute of Lux Terra Leadership Foundation, Marist International University College, a constituent College of the Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.7012141

Received: 11 December 2023; Revised: 18 December 2023; Accepted: 22 December 2023; Published: 15 January 2024

ABSTRACT

To test the reliability and validity of the Child Response Style Scale (CReSS) measuring responses to parenting, a cross-sectional online survey (20 items) was distributed via online networks: WhatsApp, email, Facebook to infinite population in Nigeria, Kenya and Ghana. Validity and reliability were tested. The internal consistency for items and the entire scale, and other measures of reliability were tested. Also, the construct validity and the criterion-referenced validity were also measured. The construct validity, criterionreferenced validity, internal consistency reliability, and split-half reliability showed good results. The CReSS achieved a correlation between Forms = .666; Spearman-Brown Coefficient rSB = .799; Guttman Split-Half Coefficient r_{sh} = .798; Cronbach' Alpha α = .840. CReSS is valid and reliable.

Keywords: Child response style, Child Response Style Scale, Parenting, Reliability, Validity

INTRODUCTION

In mental health sciences, researchers depend on indirect measurement of the indicators/responses elicited by different latent traits or characteristics through a set of observable variables (Vitoratou & Pickles, 2017). There are four critical areas in the measurement of the psychometric properties of an instrument – reliability, validity, standardised administration methods, and normative data associated with specific tests. According to White et al. (2022), research considers crucial all four psychometric criterion areas in evaluating psychometric tests (reliability, validity, standardised administration methods, and normative data). However, according to them, reliability, validity, and standardised administration methods are considered most important in selecting psychometric.

The Child Response Style Theory

Egunjobi (2021), in his child response styles to parenting, theorised that parents alone are not the predictors of a child's behavior. A child as a living entity is capable of micromanaging her/his life even from the womb. A child is knowledgeable about life in the womb and from where s/he begins to learn and interact with the world outside the womb. When a child is born into the world, s/he is not born a tabula rasa (Locke, 1689) cited in (Maden, 2021). Instead, as Egunjobi theorised, a child is constantly observing her/his environment and learning to adapt as much as possible by responding to the different environmental stimuli (in the form of nurturing and/or parenting). Although, Egunjobi (2019) posited that "in the success of nature you were nurtured; in the success of nurture, you are you", he added that every child has a 'will' which makes it possible to make decisions. Every child thus responds to nurturing in different ways (Egunjobi, 2021). This is why a child can refuse breast-feeding and children whom the same parent raises may not behave the same way as they do not respond the same way to the same parenting or parenting style.

Against the backdrop of the numerous studies associating parenting styles with children's exhibited

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023



behaviours (Akpunne et al., 2020; Iotti et al., 2023; Boakye, 2021), Egunjobi (2021) presented child response styles to parenting such as adherer, rejecter, falser and nonchalant, and argued that how children perceive and respond to parenting also influences their behaviours.

The adherer child responds positively to the parenting style. This child strives to be like either of the parents, reasons, talks, reacts, and approach life as the parent role model will. S/he is like a parent incarnate.

The rejecter child responds opposite to the parenting style. The child could be termed 'different' as s/he behaves directly opposite the parenting style or parental expectation. S/he does not want to be like either or both parents.

The falser child responds to parenting style by being in-between. S/he can behave like an adherer at one time, and a rejecter at another time, yet s/he is neither an adherer nor a rejecter. This child expresses a double-standard approach to things. Such a child can be seen as a well-behaved child while with the parents but act differently when the parents are not in sight.

The nonchalant child responds to parenting style by appearing calm, relaxed, serene, and tranquil, because they are unconcerned with the parents' attitudes or not worried about the parents' way of handling matters. Hence, s/he can be difficult to understand and unpredictable.

In addition, Egunjobi (2021) posited that everyone adopts any of these response styles depending on the situation. In other words, studies on child behaviour must take cognizance of the contribution the child's response to parenting makes on their behaviour and not just focus on parenting styles. However, one style is more dominant. He demonstrated the prevalence of these response styles by developing an instrument called the Child Response Style Scale.

The Child Response Style Scale

The Child Response Style Scale (CReSS) was developed by Egunjobi (2021). The scale consists of 20 items with the aim of categorizing a person's response style as an adherer, rejecter, falser, or nonchalant. Through a global, online survey of individuals aged 11 and above Egunjobi examined the prevalence of the child response style to parenting, identifying the characteristics of each child response style to parenting. The results showed the prevalence of the child response style to parenting as 65.5% Adherers, 4.8% Rejecters, 17.5% Falsers and 12.5% Non-chalant styles. In addition, majority (Mean = 81.5%) of the respondents displayed some characteristics of an adherer child while 26.1% (Mean) indicated some characteristics of a rejecter child and 18% (Mean) of the respondents related with some characteristics of a falser.

From the study, the child response style could be seen as the manner the child appropriates or does not appropriate the values inherent in the training experiences in the family, representing the child's subjective view of how they are raised, the feelings associated with that interpretation, and the reactions to that feeling. On the one hand, such subjective views may lead to beliefs about aspects of parenting that are contrary to what children were taught, and on the other hand, these beliefs are expressed as responses.

Granted that Egunjobi (2012)'s perspective seems a novel contribution to the literature on the relationship between parenting and children's behaviors, the instrument he used to measure the response styles lacked psychometric properties. The instrument needs scrutiny. How reliable is this instrument? How valid? This is what this study is set to establish.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to identify the evidence for the internal consistency and criterion-referenced validity of the child response style scale (CReSS) by Egunjobi (2021)



METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a survey design. Infinite population of males and females from three nationalities, namely Nigeria, Kenya and Ghana, were targeted. These were aged 11 years and older. The sample size from the infinite population was obtained using Godden (2004) formula:

SS = [Z 2 p (1 - p)]/C2

Where,

SS = Sample size

Z = Given Z value

p = Percentage of population

C = Confidence level.

The confidence level is 99,

Confidence interval is 0.01,

The corresponding z value is 2.576

 $SS = [(2.58)2 \times 0.05 \times (1-0.05)] / 0.012 = 316$

A voluntary sampling method was adopted since the research instrument was adapted to Google Forms to collect data. The instrument was administered in subsets via WhatsApp, Facebook, and email. Any participant below the age of 17 was permitted and guided by any of the parents or guardians. The general survey produced data for the test for internal consistency, while a subset of 40 participants (37 responded) were assigned a test-retest activity, administered a week apart. Another subset of 39 participants aged 11 – 15 (37 responded) were administered the 11-items Aggressive behaviour scale developed by Orpinas and Frankowski (2001) for the criterion-referenced validity test.

FINDINGS

Although, 316 respondents were sampled from the infinite population, only 240 individuals; male (139) and female (101) aged 11 years old and above, participated in the study, meeting 76% response rate. According to Dessel (2013), a response rate of 20% is considered good for an online survey, and a response rate of 30% is considered very good. The response rate of this study is considered extremely good.

1. Reliability statistics of Child Response Style Scale

A test was conducted to find out the reliability of the internal consistency of child response style scale. The results were coded and analysed. The SPSS version 25 was used to carry out this statistical analysis. For the criterion-referenced validity test, a subset of the entire sample (15.4%) responded to the Aggressive behaviour scale. The data was coded and the weighted mean used to correlate the values to the weighted mean of the same subset (15.4%) on the child response style scale.

According to Cronbach (1951), the alpha analysis of $\alpha < .5$ is considered undesirable; $\leq \alpha$.6 is considered poor; $\alpha \leq .7$ is considered acceptable; $\alpha < .9$ is considered good; and $\alpha \geq .9$ is considered excellent.





Findings are tabulated in Table 1.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics for Internal Consistency

No of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean	Standard deviation
20	.840	40.63	10.904

As seen in Table 1, results of the reliability test show that the child response style scale had the total number of 20 items, an alpha of $\alpha = .840$, (M = 40.63, SD = 10.904) and this is considered good.

Table 2. Test –Retest reliability analysis

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items	N of Items
.941	.943	40

The results from Table 2 indicates that the scale is reliable based on the test-retest reliability value of $\alpha = .941$

Table 3. Correlations between aggressive behaviour and child response

		AGGRESIVENESS	CHILDRESPONSE
	Pearson Correlation	1	.611
AGGRESIVENESS	Sig. (2-tailed)		.004
	N	37	37
	Pearson Correlation	.611	1
CHILD RESPONSE	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	
	N	37	37

As seen in Table 3, findings revealed that there was a strong positive and significant relationship (r = 0.611, p = .004) between aggressive behaviour and child response among the survey population. Since the p-value (.004) was less than 0.05, hence there is a relationship. The criterion referenced test results show that the CReSS is valid. This finding indicates the possibility of using the child response style scale as a predictor of aggressive and non- aggressive adolescent behaviour.

Table 4. Split-Half Item correlation

	Part 1	Value	.730
	Part 1	Value N of Items	10 ^a
Cronbach's Alpha	Dort 2	Value N of Items	.747
	Part 2	N of Items	10 ^b
	Total	N of Items	20
Pearson Correlation			.666
Smaanman Drawn Coofficient	Equal	Length	.799
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Unequ	Length al Length	.799
Guttman Split-Half Coefficier	nt		.798

As seen in Table 4, a split-half correlation analysis was carried out among the items of the child response scale, The child response style scale had a Cronbach's Alpha (a = .747), and the strength of Pearson's

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023



coefficient correlation (r = .666), Spearman Coefficient (.799), while the Guttman Split-Half Coefficient (.798). Findings showed that all the items of the child response scale, were strongly correlated.

DISCUSSIONS

This study's objective was to identify the evidence for the construct and criterion reference validity and internal consistency of the child response style scale (CReSS) by Egunjobi (2021). The results show the existence of four categories of response style with robust psychometric parameters. Although, the sample can be considered representative of the Nigeria, Ghanaian and Kenyan population, there is still the need for future studies including broader and more diverse samples.

The study reviewed the recommendations from earlier studies on how to measure psychometric properties. Wei et al. (2017) presented a model of the systematic review of psychometric scales. Barber et al. (2017) and Newman-Taylor (2017) researched newly developed scales. Kelly (2017) examined a large cross-sectional psychometric study across 21 European countries. In addition, Sattler (2001) cited in Viejo et al. (2018) recommended that tests with reliability coefficients <0.6 (e.g., correlations mentioned above) be deemed unreliable. Moreover, for research purposes, Sattler (2001) suggested that tests with reliability coefficients \geq 0.6 and <0.7 be considered marginally reliable and those with coefficients \geq 0.7 be considered relatively reliable.

In reliability, researchers ask: are we measuring what we want to measure effectively? There are three main types of reliability in the test theory: test–retest reliability (stability), inter-rater (equivalence) reliability and internal consistency (equivalence/stability) and all three are derived using standard statistical tests (Vitoratou & Pickles, 2017). For a psychometric test to be reliable, its results should be consistent (test-retest reliability), across items (internal reliability), and across raters (inter-rater reliability) and internal reliability demands that the individual items on a given test should measure the same domain(s) or trait(s) (i.e., internal consistency), so that reproducibility, or test-retest reliability, requires that consistent scores would be obtained from the same individual upon repeated testing (White et al. (2022). The most popular criterion used to assess internal consistency was developed by Sattler (2001).

For test-retest reliability, high correlations between repeated administrations of a test to the same person within an appropriate time interval ensure that the test can consistently measure trait(s) assessed by the instrument in an individual. According to White et al. (2022), test-retest reliability is generally assessed by intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC; ideally >0.4), Pearson correlation coefficient (ideally >0.3). In addition, when evaluating a given psychometric test, it must have internal consistency reliability coefficients of ≥ 0.6 (e.g., Cronbach's alpha, ICC) to be considered "adequate." (White et al., 2022). The results of the study showed significant correlation both at 0.01 (2 tailed) and 0.05 (2 tailed analysis).

By utilizing the broader scientific knowledge in our area of research, we are able to gather evidence to answer this question, and the validity assessment can be conducted using simple methods such as correlations and regressions or using more sophisticated methods to address cross-cultural bias, such as receiver operating characteristic curves for comparing with gold-standard criteria or anchoring vignettes for assessing validity (Vitoratou & Pickles, 2017).

CONCLUSION

From the results of the study, the child response style scale has adequate psychometric properties and is assumed to be appropriate to measure what it claims to measure. The study reported here identified the psychometric properties of the child response style scale as follows: Correlation Between Forms was .666, Spearman-Brown Coefficient rSB = .799, and Guttman Split-Half Coefficient $r_{SD} = .798$ at Cronbach' Alpha

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023



 α = .840. The results propose that the child response scale can be applied to any age bracket, gender and educational level in measuring the manner in which the individual responds to parenting. Parenting includes all forms of relationships with parents and caregivers. Since, according to Egunjobi (2021), a child is a child of the parents, irrespective of age and social status, the scale may be applied to current attitudes as well as past responses to parenting.

However, more research is recommended to adapt the CReSS to diverse contexts and age brackets. The study might be limited by the high social desirability of the scale. In addition, the study employed only quantitative method and could have been made more robost if a mixed method was used. Moreover, the study was not designed to control extraneous variables that could have contributed to the results.

REFERENCES

- 1. Barber, J.M., Parsons, H., Wilson, C.A., & Cook, C.C.H. (2017). Measuring mental health in the clinical setting: What is important to service users? The Mini-Service user Recovery Evaluation scale (Mini-SeRvE). Journal of Mental Health: 10.1080/09638237.2017.1340624
- 2. Egunjobi, J. P. (2019). You Are the Success! https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337464190_YOU_ARE_THE_SUCCESS
- 3. Egunjobi, J. P. (2021). Child Response Styles to Parenting. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS) |Volume V, Issue XII http://www.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2021.51225
- 4. Furnham A, & Crump J. (2017). Personality correlates of passive-aggressiveness: A NEO-PI-R domain and facet analysis of the HDS Leisurely scale. Journal of Mental Health: http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/09638237.2016.1167853
- 5. Kelly, B.D. (2017). Exploring and explaining the "Santa Claus effect": Cross-sectional study of jollity in 21 European countries. Journal of Mental Health: 10.1080/09638237.2017.1370643
- 6. Maden, J. (2021). John Locke's Empiricism: Why We Are All Tabula Rasas (Blank Slates). Philosophy Break. https://philosophybreak.com/articles/john-lockes-empiricism-why-we-are-all-tabula-rasas-blank-slates/
- 7. Moustaki, I. & Knott, M. (2000). Generalised latent trait models. Psychometrika, 65, 391–411
- 8. Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The Aggression scale: A Self-report measure of aggressive behavior for young adolescents. Journal of Early Adolescence, 21, 50-67.
- 9. Vitoratou, S.& Pickles, A. (2017) A note on contemporary psychometrics, Journal of Mental Health, 26(6), 486-488: 1080/09638237.2017.1392008
- 10. Wei,Y., McGrath, P.J., Hayden, J. & Kutcher, S. (2017). Measurement properties of mental health literacy tools measuring help-seeking: A systematic review. Journal of Mental Health: 10.1080/09638237.2016.1276532
- 11. White, R. F., Braun, J. M., Kopylev, L., et al. (2022). NIEHS Report on Evaluating Features and Application of Neurodevelopmental Tests in Epidemiological Studies: NIEHS Report 01. Research Triangle Park (NC): National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences; Part 1: Principles for Evaluating Psychometric Tests. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK581902/

APPENDIX A

CHILD RESPONSE STYLE SCALE (CReSS)

Developed by Joyzy Pius Egunjobi in 2021 to determine a child's dominant response style to parenting and other life situations.

Parent(s) in this scale represent the person/people with whom one grew up such as biological parent(s),

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023



adopted parent(s), grandparent (s), foster parent (s), elder sibling, or other caregivers. Pick only one response, a, b, c, or d, in each item that best expresses your view about or your relationship with your parent(s) with whom you grew up. DO NOT SKIP ANY NUMBER.

Who did you grow up with? [] Both parents [] Father [] Mother [] Other:

- 1. My parents
 - 1. Know what I can do
 - 2. See me as not listening to them
 - 3. Think they know me
 - 4. Have no idea what is in my mind
- 2. I like
 - 1. To be like my parents
 - 2. To do my own things
 - 3. To please my parents even when I don't agree with them
 - 4. To be on my own
- 3. I am
 - 1. Very open
 - 2. Different
 - 3. Pretentious
 - 4. Indifferent
- 4. I do
 - 1. Things like my parents
 - 2. Things different from my parents
 - 3. Things that seem like my parents
 - 4. Things my own ways
- 5. I
- 1. Worry about what my parents think about me
- 2. Don't follow what my parents think about me
- 3. Am not exactly what my parents think about me
- 4. Am not worried about what my parents think about me
- 6. I am
 - 1. Dependent
 - 2. Independent
 - 3. Unpredictable
 - 4. Misunderstood
- 7. I am
 - 1. Fearful
 - 2. Fearless
 - 3. Watchful
 - 4. Calm
- 8. I
- 1. Want to be respected
- 2. Like to be respected
- 3. Play to be respected
- 4. Own my respect
- 9. I am
 - 1. The good child
 - 2. The rebellious child
 - 3. The surprising child

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023



4. The quiet child

10. I feel

- 1. Sad if my parents disapprove of me
- 2. Less concerned if my parents disapprove of me
- 3. Not good if my parents disapprove of me
- 4. No concern if my parents disapprove of me

11. I do

- 1. Everything to please my parents
- 2. Less things to please my parents
- 3. Pretend to please my parents
- 4. Nothing to please my parents

12. When someone is fighting my mother/father

- 1. I will fight the person
- 2. I will take my parent away
- 3. I will support my parent but will have no problem with the person
- 4. I will not want to be involved

13. I behave

- 1. outside exactly the way I behave at home
- 2. outside somewhat the way I behave at home
- 3. outside differently from the way I behave at home
- 4. outside indifferently from the way I behave at home

14. I am who I am today

- 1. because of the way I was raised
- 2. opposite from the way I was raised
- 3. somewhat because of the way I was raised
- 4. indifferently from the way I was raised

15. My parents

- 1. Are my world
- 2. Are just my parents
- 3. Are my friends
- 4. Are my parents

16. I will

- 1. Raise my children the same way I was raised
- 2. Not raise my children the same way I was raised
- 3. I may somewhat raise my children the same way I was raised
- 4. Choose to raise my children the way I want irrespective of the way I was raised

17. I believe that parents are

- 1. Right most of the time
- 2. Are not always right
- 3. May be right
- 4. Right or wrong, I don't care

18. I

- 1. Love my parents
- 2. Like my parents
- 3. Feel for my parents
- 4. Am neutral about my parents

19. I can be

- 1. Very good
- 2. Very stubborn
- 3. Very flexible

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023



- 4. Very calm
- 20. I can
 - 1. Compromise easily
 - 2. Compromise with difficulty
 - 3. Compromise only to please others
 - 4. Compromise to be out of troubles

APPENDIX B

CHILD RESPONSE STYLE SCALE (CReSS) - SCORING

Scoring		
Add the numbers of	a	b
c	d	
The highest calculated sco	re indicates your preferred response	e style as

- 1. Adherer
- 2. Rejecter
- 3. Falser
- 4. Nonchalant

SUMMARY OF EACH RESPONSE STYLE

- 1. **The adherer** child responds positively to the parenting style. This child strives to be like either of the parents, reasons, talks, reacts, and approach life as the parent role model will. S/he is like a parent incarnate.
- 2. **The rejecter** child responds opposite to the parenting style. The child could be termed 'different' as s/he behaves directly opposite the parenting style or parental expectation. S/he does not want to be like either or both parents.
- 3. **The falser** child responds to parenting style by being in-between. S/he can behave like an adherer at one time, and a rejecter at another time, yet s/he is neither an adherer nor a rejecter. This child expresses a double-standard approach to things. Such a child can be seen as a well-behaved child while with the parents but act differently when the parents are not in sight.
- 4. **The nonchalant** child responds to parenting style by appearing calm, relaxed, serene, and tranquil, because they are unconcerned with the parents' attitudes or not worried about the parents' way of handle matters. Hence, s/he can be difficult to understand and unpredictable.

APPENDIX C

Total Variance Explained												
Component	Initial	Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings								
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %						
1	5.325		26.625		26.625	26.625						
2	1.485	7.424	34.049	1.485	7.424	34.049						
3	1.341	6.704	40.754	1.341	6.704	40.754						
4	1.218	6.092	46.846	1.218	6.092	46.846						



5	1.053	5.265	52.111	1.053	5.265	52.111
6	1.016	5.082	57.193	1.016	5.082	57.193
7	.916	4.580	61.773			
8	.872	4.358	66.131			
9	.804	4.021	70.152			
10	.769	3.844	73.996			
11	.696	3.480	77.476			
12	.657	3.285	80.762			
13	.622	3.108	83.869			
14	.563	2.817	86.687			
15	.559	2.793	89.479			
16	.499	2.496	91.976			
17	.467	2.337	94.313			
18	.429	2.146	96.459			
19	.377	1.886	98.345			
20	.331	1.655	100.000			
Extraction	Method	d: Principal Co	omponent Analy	/sis.		

Component Matrix ^a						
	Con	ponent				
	1	2	3	4	5	6
MYPARENT	.531	210	111	274	097	170
ILIKE	.574	063	359	257	219	.080
IAM	.607	048	.028	375	013	125
IDO	.542	.044	360	.185	397	157
I	.509	.099	.501	.147	330	196
IAM2	.604	050	006	156	.069	445
IAM3	.271	.561	192	096	.206	.187
<u>I2</u>	.297	.531	.044	.338	073	.002
IAM4	.509	.471	048	221	.097	254
IFEEL	.456	.114	.433	090	202	.306
IDO2	.488	.074	.545	049	129	.219
WHENSOMEISFIGHTINGMYMOTHER	.389	.226	.183	.339	.393	241
IBEHAVE	.582	214	.171	167	.110	193
IAMWHOIAMTODAY	.582	401	097	.041	.164	.291
MYPARENTS	.493	165	084	.469	283	.184
IWILL	.562	052	335	.272	180	001
IBELIEVETHAT	.643	202	010	.105	.214	.039
I3	.584	328	.158	.031	.356	.217
ICANBE	.485	.383	214	296	.059	.446
ICAN	.427	.029	174	.367	.356	036
Extraction Method: Principal Component A	naly	sis.				
a. 6 components extracted.						





ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023

APPENDIX D

Correlations

			I AN/DADEN	- I u uz-	1444	IDO			COII			ieee.	IDOO	MULTAL	I IDELLAY (E	LANDAULOLANTODAY	LAN/DADENTO	84/11	LIDELIE /ETILAT	l 10	LIGANIDE LIGANI
	I D	and to the co	MYPAREN'		IAM	IDO	1	IAM2	IAM3	12	IAM4	IFEEL	IDO2	WHEN	IBEHAVE	IAMWHOIAMTODAY	MYPARENTS	IWILL	IBELIEVETHAT	13	ICANBE ICAN
	Pearson Co			.333"	.335"	.316"	.220"	.353"	.095	.024	.199"	.237"	.124	.088	.271"	.240"	.181"	.224"	.292"	.363"	.183" .163
	Sig. (2-taile	d)	23	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.142 239	.710 239	.002	.000	.056 239	.176 239	.000	.000	.005	.000	.000	.000	.005 .012 239 239
MYPARENT	IN	Bias	23		001	005	.002	.001	.003	002	003	007	011	006	002	005	005	005	006	006	006009
WITAKENI		Std. Error		0 .058		.053	.065				.068		.076	.078	.080	.071	.067	.063		.071	.060 .074
	Bootstrap ^c		ower		.068			.067	.063	.061		.066			.104	.071			.067	.208	
				1 .228	.211	.199	.089	.215	045 .219	089	.063	.108	038 .247	069 .246	.104	.365	.045	.091	.432	.486	.053 .004 .296 .294
	D				.404"	.393"	.143	.324"	.104	.085	.245"	.197"	.140	.099	.248"	.305	.271"	.293"		.275"	
	Pearson Co Sig. (2-taile		.333			.000	.027	.000	.104	.188	.000		.030	.099	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.370" .178"
	N Sig. (2-taile	u)	23		.000	239	239	239	239	239	239	.002	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
ILIKE	IN	Bias	.00			.003	005	.000	002	004	003	003	009	005	007	004	005	004	.000	006	.003004
ILIKE		Std. Error	.05		.055	.061	.068	.064	.073	.066	.062	.067	.073	.072	.077	.062	.068	.061	.064	.058	.054 .071
	Bootstrap ^c		ower .22		.303	.276	.011	.204	050	030	.116	.072	016	059	.079	.174	.111	.159	.144	.160	.266 .014
			Ipper .44			.498	.275	.455	.240	.211	.369	.339	.272	.249	.396	.413	.400	.403	.380	.383	.484 .309
	Pearson Co		.335		.000	.220**	.312"	.375"	.196"	.103	.294"	.190"	.302"	.116	.357**	.337"	.148*	.245"	.385"	.271"	.230" .152
	Sig. (2-taile		.00			.001	.000	.000	.002	.113	.000	.003	.000	.073	.000	.000	.023	.000	.000	.000	.000 .019
		N			239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
IAM		Bias	00		0	007	002	004	002	.001	.000	002	006	012	009	005	012	007	006	014	005008
		Std. Error	.06		0	.052	.060	.063	.050	.062	.059	.067	.071	.067	.082	.078	.072	.059	.072	.093	.056 .067
	Bootstrap ^c		ower .21			.121	.185	.237	.084	026	.179	.055	.136	035	.190	.176	004	.115		.094	.121 .004
			Ipper .48			.316	.437	.489	.291	.223	.419	.328	.428	.230	.498	.474	.295	.348		.459	.338 .262
	Pearson Co	Pearson Correlation			.220"	.010	.282**	.210"	.112	.169"	.255"	.156	.094	.175"	.266**	.258**	.302**	.409"	.273"	.127	.236" .242"
	Sig. (2-taile		.316		.001	-	.000	.001	.084	.009	.000	.016	.148	.007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.049	.000 .000
	N	-,	23		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
IDO		Bias	00		007	0	005	.000	.002	.000	005	005	014	003	005	003	003	009	006	004	.000003
		Std. Error	.05		.052	0	.064	.063	.069	.064	.067	.065	.068	.068	.058	.050	.063	.057	.051	.056	.065 .063
	Bootstrap ^c		ower .19		.121	1	.144	.089	038	.018	.104	.025	050	.038	.155	.164	.168	.286	.157	.021	.086 .114
			Jpper .41		.316	1	.392	.336	.253	.296	.383	.281	.213	.301	.377	.359	.418	.500	.367	.220	.350 .370
	Pearson Co	Pearson Correlation			.312"	.282"	1	.273"	.092	.249"	.181"	.334"	.383"	.253"	.297"	.161	.249"	.177"	.250"	.239"	.083 .088
	Sig. (2-taile		.220		.000	.000		.000	.158	.000	.005	.000	.000	.000	.000	.012	.000	.006	.000	.000	.201 .175
	N				239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
1		Bias	.00:	2005	002	005	0	.001	002	.002	005	006	010	006	007	004	004	005	003	007	006002
		Std. Error	.06	.068	.060	.064	0	.064	.061	.063	.068	.062	.061	.063	.060	.062	.068	.067	.063	.064	.067 .065
	Bootstrap ^c	95% Confidence L	ower .08	.011	.185	.144	1	.151	030	.134	.045	.211	.250	.107	.177	.021	.099	.042	.126	.096	053047
		Interval	Jpper .35	1 .275	.437	.392	1	.406	.208	.384	.306	.450	.494	.361	.406	.290	.366	.304	.373	.355	.204 .214
	Pearson Co	rrelation	.353	.324"	.375"	.210"	.273"	1	.128*	.124	.393"	.161	.218"	.191"	.383"	.240"	.262"	.304"	.376"	.302"	.152 .188
	Sig. (2-taile	d)	.00	.000	.000	.001	.000		.048	.055	.000	.013	.001	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.018 .003
	N		23	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
IAM2		Bias	.00	1 .000	004	.000	.001	0	004	004	004	005	004	007	004	005	005	008	005	008	003006
	Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error	.06	7 .064	.063	.063	.064	0	.078	.069	.057	.071	.072	.069	.076	.075	.068	.058	.078	.078	.065 .068
	Вооізпар		ower .21	.204	.237	.089	.151	1	076	008	.267	.018	.086	.030	.231	.080	.126	.184	.216	.112	.026 .042
			Jpper .46			.336	.406	1	.279	.261	.500	.296	.362	.305	.516	.362	.394	.407	.527	.434	.294 .305
	Pearson Co		.09		.196"	.112	.092	.128	1	.212"	.226"	.063	.066	.170"	.011	.052	.090	.122	.108	.084	.320" .070
	Sig. (2-taile	d)	.14		.002	.084	.158	.048		.001	.000	.336	.310	.009	.870	.424	.166	.060	.095	.195	.000 .283
	N		23		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
IAM3		Bias	.00		002	.002	002	004	0	004	001	006	.000	005	003	008	005	002	003	010	003004
	Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error	.06		.050	.069	.061	.078	0	.068	.066	.072	.061	.066	.074	.060	.060	.066	.062	.052	.067 .066
			ower04		.084	038	030	076	1	.071	.097	083	049	.023	134	074	040	010	032	033	.181073
			Jpper .21			.253	.208	.279	1	.345	.352	.209	.194	.295	.164	.164	.201	.247	.220	.172	.459 .178
	Pearson Co		.02		.103	.169"	.249"	.124	.212"	1	.236"	.139	.118	.151	.042	.043	.141	.160	.133	.093	.179" .173"
	Sig. (2-taile	d)	.71		.113	.009	.000	.055	.001		.000	.031	.069	.019	.516	.508	.029	.013	.040	.152	.006 .007
	N	Lac	23		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
12		Bias	00		.001	.000	.002	004	004	0	004	.004	012	.006	007	.000	006	.000	008	004	003006
	Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error	.06		.062	.064	.063	.069	.068	0	.065	.068	.064	.071	.065	.060	.067	.065	.061	.064	.062 .060
			ower08		026	.018	.134	008	.071	1	.091	006	036	.001	091	075	001	.029	001	048	.055 .050
			Jpper .14		.223	.296	.384	.261	.345	1	.359	.272	.222	.294	.167	.168	.265	.289	.240	.208	.309 .295
	Pearson Correlation		.199		.294"	.255"	.181"	.393"	.226"	.236"	1	.227"	.249"	.241"	.245"	.121	.068	.242"	.215"	.116	.365" .215"
	Sig. (2-taile	a)	.00:		.000	.000	.005	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.061	.293	.000	.001	.073	.000 .001
l	N	Lac	23		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239 239
IAM4		Bias	00		.000	005	005	004	001	004	0	004	007	001	005	009	008	010	002	009	002005
	Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error	.06		.059	.067	.068	.057	.066	.065	0	.065	.064	.063	.065	.058	.073	.068	.065	.067	.064 .069
			ower .06		.179	.104	.045	.267	.097	.091	1	.088	.116	.114	.098	.003	079	.098	.076	037	.248 .091
	1	Interval	Jpper .333	.369	.419	.383	.306	.500	.352	.359	1	.343	.362	.369	.350	.225	.202	.371	.334	.230	.505 .344



ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023

	Pearson Co	relation		.237"	.197"	.190"	.156	.334"	.161*	.063	.139*	.227**	1 [.354"	.158	.221"	.188**	.179"	.127	.203**	.263"	.260"	.123
	Sig. (2-tailed			.000	.002	.003	.016	.000	.013	.336	.031	.000		.000	.015	.001	.004	.006	.050	.002	.000	.000	.058
	N (2-tailet	u)		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
IFEEL	IN.	Bias		007	003	002	005	006	005	006	.004	004	0	005	.000	005	005	003	.000	005	.002	002	003
		Std. Error		.066	.067	.067	.065	.062	.071	.072	.068	.065	0	.066	.070	.073	.075	.068	.067	.068	.073	.064	.069
	Bootstrap ^c	95% Confidence	Lower	.108	.072	.055	.025	.211	.018	083	006	.088	1	.201	002	.076	.046	.040	005	.070	.104	.118	014
		Interval	Upper	.368	.339	.328	.281	.450	.296	.209	.272	.343	1	.472	.284	.350	.322	.328	.244	.331	.409	.377	.250
	Pearson Co	rrelation	-FF-	.124	.140	.302"	.094	.383"	.218"	.066	.118	.249"	.354"	1	.165	.295"	.201"	.255"	.174"	.254"	.271"	.240"	.109
	Sig. (2-tailed			.056	.030	.000	.148	.000	.001	.310	.069	.000	.000		.011	.000	.002	.000	.007	.000	.000	.000	.093
	N	.,		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
IDO2		Bias		011	009	006	014	010	004	.000	012	007	005	0	005	009	006	001	007	.000	006	004	003
	D	Std. Error		.076	.073	.071	.068	.061	.072	.061	.064	.064	.066	0	.067	.078	.070	.061	.063	.079	.075	.057	.071
	Bootstrap ^c	95% Confidence	Lower	038	016	.136	050	.250	.086	049	036	.116	.201	1	.016	.132	.064	.143	.041	.104	.121	.123	044
		Interval	Upper	.247	.272	.428	.213	.494	.362	.194	.222	.362	.472	1	.285	.435	.327	.374	.299	.412	.422	.356	.240
	Pearson Co	rrelation	•	.088	.099	.116	.175"	.253"	.191"	.170	.151 [°]	.241"	.158	.165	1	.204"	.133	.137	.172"	.238	.230	.112	.236"
	Sig. (2-tailed	d)		.176	.127	.073	.007	.000	.003	.009	.019	.000	.015	.011		.002	.040	.034	.008	.000	.000	.085	.000
	N			239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
WHENSOMEISFIGHTINGMYMOTHER		Bias		006	005	012	003	006	007	005	.006	001	.000	005	0	007	005	.003	001	001	010	001	.000
	Bootstrap	Std. Error		.078	.072	.067	.068	.063	.069	.066	.071	.063	.070	.067	0	.066	.068	.063	.062	.066	.077	.067	.072
	Зооынар	95% Confidence	Lower	069	059	035	.038	.107	.030	.023	.001	.114	002	.016	1	.052	016	.009	.058	.095	.042	025	.097
		Interval	Upper	.246	.249	.230	.301	.361	.305	.295	.294	.369	.284	.285	1	.341	.255	.276	.294	.366	.391	.236	.374
	Pearson Co			.271"	.248**	.357"	.266"	.297"	.383"	.011	.042	.245"	.221"	.295"	.204"	1	.383"	.155	.241"	.314"	.332**	.221"	.208**
	Sig. (2-tailed	d)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.870	.516	.000	.001	.000	.002		.000	.017	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001
	N			239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
IBEHAVE		Bias		002	007	009	005	007	004	003	007	005	005	009	007	0	.001	005	002	006	010	001	002
	Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error		.080	.077	.082	.058	.060	.076	.074	.065	.065	.073	.078	.066	0	.070	.076	.065	.076	.085	.073	.073
		95% Confidence	Lower	.104	.079	.190	.155	.177	.231	134	091	.098	.076	.132	.052	1	.235	.008	.112	.163	.149	.086	.059
		Interval	Upper	.414	.396	.498	.377	.406	.516	.164	.167	.350	.350	.435	.341	1	.517	.307	.371	.466	.488	.355	.354
Pearson C				.240"	.302	.337"	.258"	.161	.240"	.052	.043	.121	.188"	.201"	.133	.383	1	.303"	.365"	.426"	.473	.226"	.198"
	Sig. (2-tailed	d)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.012	.000	.424	.508	.061	.004	.002	.040	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.002
LAMBALLIOLANTOD AV	N N	Diag		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
IAMWHOIAMTODAY		Bias Std. Error		005 .071	004 .062	005 .078	003	004 .062	005	008	.000	009 .058	005 .075	006 .070	005 .068	.001	0	005 .064	002 .046	007 .069	004	003	.000
	Bootstrap ^c	95% Confidence	Lower	.071	.174	.176	.050	.002	.075	074	075	.003	.046	.064	016	.235	1	.174	.265	.009	.286	.057	.039
		Interval	Upper	.365	.413	.474	.359	.290	.362	.164	.168	.225	.322	.327	.255	.517	1	.420	.444	.552	.624	.336	.325
	Pearson Co		Орреі	.181"	.271"	.148	.302**	.249"	.262"	.090	.141	.068	.179"	.255"	.137	.155	.303**	.420	.372"	.322"	.248"	.113	.237"
	Sig. (2-tailed			.005	.000	.023	.000	.000	.000	.166	.029	.293	.006	.000	.034	.017	.000	'	.000	.000	.000	.082	.000
	N	u)		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
MYPARENTS		Bias		005	005	012	003	004	005	005	006	008	003	001	.003	005	005	0	001	.004	009	.002	.003
		Std. Error		.067	.068	.072	.063	.068	.068	.060	.067	.073	.068	.061	.063	.076	.064	0	.058	.065	.060	.063	.064
	Bootstrap ^c	95% Confidence	Lower	.045	.111	004	.168	.099	.126	040	001	079	.040	.143	.009	.008	.174	1	.240	.197	.109	014	.094
		Interval	Upper	.305	.400	.295	.418	.366	.394	.201	.265	.202	.328	.374	.276	.307	.420	1	.483	.455	.359	.242	.358
	Pearson Co	rrelation	1 -11 -	.224"	.293"	.245"	.409"	.177"	.304"	.122	.160*	.242"	.127	.174"	.172"	.241"	.365"	.372"	1	.333"	.215"	.231"	.226"
	Sig. (2-tailed			.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.000	.060	.013	.000	.050	.007	.008	.000	.000	.000		.000	.001	.000	.000
	N			239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
IWILL		Bias		005	004	007	009	005	008	002	.000	010	.000	007	001	002	002	001	0	004	007	003	002
	Poststeen	Std. Error		.063	.061	.059	.057	.067	.058	.066	.065	.068	.067	.063	.062	.065	.046	.058	0	.056	.052	.069	.061
	Bootstrap ^c	95% Confidence	Lower	.091	.159	.115	.286	.042	.184	010	.029	.098	005	.041	.058	.112	.265	.240	1	.202	.097	.089	.102
		Interval	Upper	.338	.403	.348	.500	.304	.407	.247	.289	.371	.244	.299	.294	.371	.444	.483	1	.444	.296	.355	.341
	Pearson Co			.292**	.261"	.385"	.273"	.250"	.376"	.108	.133	.215"	.203"	.254"	.238"	.314"	.426	.322"	.333"	1	.422**	.238**	.269"
	Sig. (2-tailed	d)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.095	.040	.001	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N			239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
IBELIEVETHAT		Bias		006	.000	006	006	003	005	003	008	002	005	.000	001	006	007	.004	004	0	013	001	003
	Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error		.067	.064	.072	.051	.063	.078	.062	.061	.065	.068	.079	.066	.076	.069	.065	.056	0	.085	.063	.066
	Joodinap	95% Confidence	Lower	.151	.144	.237	.157	.126	.216	032	001	.076	.070	.104	.095	.163	.277	.197	.202	1	.246	.103	.115
		Interval	Upper	.432	.380	.508	.367	.373	.527	.220	.240	.334	.331	.412	.366	.466	.552	.455	.444	1	.576	.361	.373
	Pearson Co			.363"	.275"	.271"	.127	.239"	.302"	.084	.093	.116	.263"	.271"	.230"	.332"	.473"	.248"	.215"	.422"	1	.184"	.270"
<u> </u>	Sig. (2-tailed	d)		.000	.000	.000	.049	.000	.000	.195	.152	.073	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000		.004	.000
				239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
	N					014	004	007	008	010	004	009	.002	006	010	010	004	009	007	013	0	008	004
13	N	Bias		006	006																		
13	N Bootstrap ^c	Std. Error		.071	.058	.093	.056	.064	.078	.052	.064	.067	.073	.075	.077	.085	.085	.060	.052	.085	0	.059	.062
13			Lower											.075 .121 .422	.077 .042 .391	.085 .149 .488	.085 .286 .624	.060 .109 .359	.052 .097 .296		0	.059 .057 .296	.062 .145 .383



ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume VII Issue XII December 2023

	Pearson Co	rrelation		.183"	.370"	.230"	.236"	.083	.152	.320"	.179"	.365"	.260**	.240"	.112	.221"	.226"	.113	.231"	.238"	.184"	1 [.174"
	Sig. (2-taile	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005	.000	.000	.000	.201	.018	.000	.006	.000	.000	.000	.085	.001	.000	.082	.000	.000	.004		.007
	N	,		239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
ICANBE		Bias		006	.003	005	.000	006	003	003	003	002	002	004	001	001	003	.002	003	001	008	0	008
	Bootstrap	Std. Error		.060	.054	.056	.065	.067	.065	.067	.062	.064	.064	.057	.067	.073	.057	.063	.069	.063	.059	0	.072
	Бооізпар	95% Confidence	Lower	.053	.266	.121	.086	053	.026	.181	.055	.248	.118	.123	025	.086	.122	014	.089	.103	.057	1	.022
		Interval	Upper	.296	.484	.338	.350	.204	.294	.459	.309	.505	.377	.356	.236	.355	.336	.242	.355	.361	.296	1	.300
	Pearson Co	orrelation		.163	.178	.152	.242"	.088	.188"	.070	.173"	.215"	.123	.109	.236"	.208"	.198"	.237"	.226"	.269"	.270"	.174"	1
	Sig. (2-taile	d)		.012	.006	.019	.000	.175	.003	.283	.007	.001	.058	.093	.000	.001	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.007	
	N			239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
ICAN		Bias		009	004	008	003	002	006	004	006	005	003	003	.000	002	.000	.003	002	003	004	008	0
	Bootstrap	Std. Error		.074	.071	.067	.063	.065	.068	.066	.060	.069	.069	.071	.072	.073	.059	.064	.061	.066	.062	.072	0
	Dootstrap	95% Confidence	Lower	.004	.014	.004	.114	047	.042	073	.050	.091	014	044	.097	.059	.077	.094	.102	.115	.145	.022	1
		Interval	Upper	.294	.309	.262	.370	.214	.305	.178	.295	.344	.250	.240	.374	.354	.325	.358	.341	.373	.383	.300	1

^{**.} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

^{*.} Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

c. Unless otherwise noted, bootstrap results are based on 240 bootstrap samples