

# 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, criterion-referenced validity, internal consistency reliability, and split-half reliability showed good results. The CReSS achieved a correlation between Forms = .666; Spearman-Brown Coefficient  $r_{SB} = .799$ ; Guttman Split-Half Coefficient  $r_{sb} = .798$ ; Cronbach' Alpha  $\alpha = .840$ . 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

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 (CRSS) 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 (CRSS) 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:

$$SS = [Z^2 p (1 - p)] / C^2$$

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

Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.730
		N of Items	10 <sup>a</sup>
	Part 2	Value	.747
		N of Items	10 <sup>b</sup>
	Total N of Items		20
Pearson Correlation			.666
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length	.799	
	Unequal Length	.799	
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			.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 ( $\alpha = .747$ ), and the strength of Pearson's

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  $\geq 0.6$  (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  $r_{SB} = .799$ , and Guttman Split-Half Coefficient  $r_{sb} = .798$  at Cronbach' Alpha



$\alpha = .840$ . 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 robust 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](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),

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

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



- 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 score indicates your preferred response 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		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.325	26.625	26.625	5.325	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: Principal Component Analysis.

**Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>**

	Component					
	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
I2	.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 Analysis.

a. 6 components extracted.





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