Spanish Adaptation of the Perceived Responsiveness and Insensitivity Scale

María Alonso-Ferres
University of Almería

Inmaculada Valor-Segura
University of Granada

Hannah C. Williamson
University of Texas at Austin

Author Note

María Alonso-Ferres https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8081-3428

Inmaculada Valor-Segura https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2303-3326

Hannah C. Williamson https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4816-3621

This work was supported by a Fulbright Scholar Award to Hannah Williamson.

The authors would like to thank Celia Serrano-Montilla for her assistance in the translation process.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Inmaculada Valor-Segura. Email: ivalor@ugr.es

Word Count: 3490

Abstract

Perceived partner responsiveness is the extent to which one feels understood, validated, and cared for by their intimate partner. This is a centrally important construct in relationship science, with a robust literature indicating that individuals who perceive higher levels of responsiveness from their partner experiencing better relationship outcomes. Despite the large role that this construct plays in relationship science and our understanding of healthy relationship functioning, there is no measure adapted to Spanish language and culture. This study presents the 16-item and 8-item versions of the recently developed and psychometrically improved Perceived Responsiveness and Insensitivity Scale (PRIS; Crasta et al., 2021) that has been adapted to Spanish. Using a sample of 493 Spanish individuals, results demonstrate that this adapted scale exhibits adequate reliability, maintains the same internal structure as the original English version, demonstrates gender invariance, and presents adequate validity evidence when is associated to other variables. Adding the Spanish Adaptation of the PRIS (PRIS-SA) to the methodological toolkit of relationship scientists will allow this important construct to be examined in a cross-cultural fashion and among a diverse array of couples.

Keywords: intimate relationships, perceived partner responsiveness, Spanish adaptation, validity evidence, psychometric properties

Spanish Adaptation of the Perceived Responsiveness and Insensitivity Scale

Feeling understood, validated, and cared for by one's partner are hallmarks of a strong intimate relationship. This experience, known as perceived partner responsiveness (PPR), is critical to our understanding of relationships (Reis, 2012). PPR predicts pro-relationship behaviors, such as expressing gratitude, forgiveness, providing social support, and use of constructive conflict resolution strategies (Algoe & Zhaoyang, 2016; Alonso-Ferres et al., 2021; Maisel & Gable, 2009; Pansera & La Guardia, 2012). Moreover, PPR has been linked to various relational outcomes, including relationship satisfaction, feelings of intimacy or inclusion of the partner in the self, and the secure bonds underlying attachment orientations (Gadassi et al., 2016; Gunaydin et al., 2021; Laurenceau et al., 2005).

Despite the abundant evidence for the importance of PPR in close relationships, no culturally adapted measure is currently available to assess this construct in Spanish populations, which are extremely under-represented in relationship science research (Williamson et al., 2022). To facilitate the expansion of close relationship studies to linguistically and culturally diverse populations, it is essential to have properly validated measures of key constructs in various languages and cultures. Responsiveness, one of the 14 core principles of relationship science (Finkel et al., 2017), is a prime candidate for such adaptation.

Now is an especially opportune time to develop a Spanish measure of PPR because a psychometrically optimized measure of this construct – the Partner Responsiveness and Insensitivity Scale (PRIS; Crasta et al., 2021) has recently been developed, including a brief format. Additionally, recent evidence suggests that PPR may operate differently across nations/cultures, emphasizing the need for culturally sensitive tools. This adaptation provides a

solid foundation for capturing the unique cultural nuances and relational dynamics specific to Spain, supporting future cross-cultural research (Choi & Oishi, 2023; Wu et al., 2021).

The current study addresses this major methodological gap in the relationship science literature by presenting the 16-item and 8-item versions of the PRIS, which have been adapted to the Spanish language and the cultural and linguistic context of Spain. We examine the psychometric properties of this adaptation to ensure its reliability, and confirm that its internal structure aligns with the original scale. Moreover, following the procedures of Crasta et al. (2021), we assess the scale invariance across genders, and establish adequate validity evidence related to other relevant variables.

Method

Transparency and Openness

Below we describe how we determined our sample size, data exclusions, and relevant measures. The analyses and hypotheses were pre-registered and the materials, data, and analytic code are available at OSF: https://osf.io/4b9cu/?view_only=baf9f353dfb04f82a1f6e494d75e528e. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at [anonymized].

Procedure

We first obtained permission from the authors of the original PRIS to carry out the Spanish adaptation. Next, we adapted the measure from English to Spanish linguistic and cultural context following the translation by committee approach (Harkness, 2003). A group of four professionals with different areas of expertise—linguistic, psychological target construct, and psychometrics—collaboratively prepared, discussed, and revised the translation to fit the Spanish culture and language. Specifically, two bilingual specialists first translated the original

version of the PRIS to Spanish, then the committee met to review the two versions of the translation and agree on a final, best translation to ensure balance in psychological, linguistic, and cultural aspects (Hambleton & de Jong, 2003).

The adapted measure, demographic questions, and validation tools were completed by participants via Qualtrics. They were recruited through snowball sampling, with University of Granada undergraduates, trained in sampling methods, distributing the survey.

Participants

A total of 605 participants were recruited from the general Spanish population. 112 participants were dropped from the analytic sample because they did not meet the inclusion criteria (i.e., respond correctly to three embedded attention check items, be involved in a romantic relationship for 6 months, and identify as Spanish). The final analytic sample (N = 493) was comprised of 59.4% women, 40.0% men, and 0.6% who indicated having a different gender identity than the previously provided option. Participants were 39.96 years old on average (*SD* = 13.74; range: 18-81 years) and 89.2% identified as heterosexual, 6.5% as bisexual, 1.7% as lesbian, 2.4% as gay, and 0.2% did not identify with any of the previously provided options. They reported being together with their partner for an average of 13.99 years (*SD* = 12.61; range: 6 months to 50 years), and 43% were married and living together, 25.2% were unmarried but in a cohabiting relationship, and 31.8% dating and not living together.[1]

Measures

Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Insensitivity was measured with the newly developed Spanish Adaptation of the Perceived Responsiveness and Insensitivity Scale (PRIS-

[1] See additional sociodemographic data in Supplemental material.

SA). Following Crasta et al. (2021), the measure includes a 16-item version (PRIS-SA) with 8 items belonging to the responsiveness subscale and 8 to the insensitivity subscale; and an 8-item version (brief PRIS-SA) with 4 items on each subscale (full text presented in Table 1).

Relationship Satisfaction was assessed with the Spanish version of the Couples Satisfaction Index (Hendershot, 2022). The scale consists of four items, with three scored on a 6-point scale and one scored on a 7-point scale (ω =.85).

Inclusion of the Other in the Self was measured with the Inclusion of the Other in the Self scale (IOS; Aron et al., 1992). This single item pictorial measure includes five sets of two circles in which one of the circles represents the "self" of the participant and the other circle represents their "partner." Each set depicts the circles with different degrees of overlap (1 = *totally independent*, 5 = *almost completely overlapping*) and participants select the picture which most closely represents their relationship.

Conflict Resolution was measured with the Spanish version of the Accommodation Among Romantic Couples Scale (Valor-Segura et al., 2020). This instrument has 27 items (1 = *never does that*, 9 = *always shows that type of behavior*) that assess four types of conflict-facing strategies: voice (ω =.76), loyalty (ω =.69), exit (ω =.89), and neglect (α =.81).

Attachment was measured with the Spanish version of the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (Guzmán-González et al., 2020). This measure consists of 12 items (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) which measure anxious (ω =.78) and avoidant (ω =.82) attachment.

Results

Preliminary Item Level Analyses

As depicted in Table 1, means, skewness and kurtosis values for the observed variables (i.e., items) were generally within acceptable ranges, especially for the responsiveness subscale. However, it's noteworthy that the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test (univariate normality) returned significant results for all items (ps < 0.001), as did the Mardia test for multivariate normality (MS =5019.42, p < 0.001; MK = 64.67, p < 0.001), indicating that the data did not strictly adhere to a normal distribution.

Internal Structure

Next, we test the PRIS-SA's dimensionality by performing confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) in R software. Given the non-normal distribution of the data, we conducted the CFAs using the robust maximum likelihood estimation method. As reported in Table 2, the obtained values for a model with two first-order correlated factors (M1) were excellent for the 16-item (PRIS-SA) and the 8-items version of the scale (brief PRIS-SA). Although we confirmed the fit of the same two-factor model from the original version of the PRIS, as a robustness check we also evaluated the fit of a one-dimensional model (M2) and a second-order factor model: two factors—responsiveness and insensitivity—nested into one second-order factor (M3). As shown in Table 2, M1 and M3 fit the data better compared to M2. However, the differences in goodness-of-fit indices between M1 and M3 are minimal. A likelihood ratio test was conducted to compare the fit of M1 and M3, revealing no significant differences between them (p =.997). Despite that, to replicate and compare the original factor structure of the scale, and considering critiques of the second-order model regarding its parsimonious factorial solution (Flanagan et al., 2012), the two correlated factors model (M1) was endorsed as the latent structure of the scale for the Spanish population. Table 1 displays the two-factor structure of the PRIS-SA and brief PRIS-SA. All factor loadings were higher than 0.82 and statistically significant at the p <.001 level. Similarly,

both dimensions exhibited good internal consistency in the PRIS-SA and brief PRIS-SA, respectively: responsiveness (ω =.95; ω =.91) and insensitivity (ω =.82; ω =.69).

Measurement Invariance by Gender

To test for invariance by gender, we calculated multigroup CFAs. Due to the low percentage of individuals identifying as another gender (0.6%), the analysis will only compare those identified as women or men. Configural model determined whether men and women conceptualized the construct in the same way, estimating the same model for both groups without constrained parameters. The metric invariance model introduced constraints—that is, factor loadings for both models were equal—confirming whether men and women understood the items on the PRIS-SA and brief PRIS-SA equally. A scalar model incorporated constrained thresholds to observe whether the latent factors showed the same item scores for men and women. Finally, we assigned strict invariance model fixed loadings, thresholds, and item variances at the same value across groups. Cutoff values to support a more restrictive invariance measurement model were changes less than or equal to 0.010 and 0.015 in CFI and RMSEA, respectively (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). Results (Table 3) supported configural and metric invariance by gender, indicating that men and women conceptualized the constructs of perceived partner responsiveness and insensitivity similarly and interpreted the items in a consistent manner. Furthermore, both scalar and the strict factorial invariance model were also supported, allowing for meaningful comparisons of means and variances for the two dimensions of PRI-SA and brief PRIS-SA between men and women.[2]

Validity Evidence

[2] Measurement invariance by age and relationship duration has also been tested. Please refer to the Supplemental Material for the full analyses.

We examined Pearson correlation—and their 95% confidence intervals—between the responsiveness and insensitivity subscales of both the PRIS-SA and the brief PRIS-SA and other relevant constructs within the nomological network validated in Spanish. Results (Table 4) indicate that perceived partner *responsiveness* was significantly positively correlated with relationship satisfaction, inclusion of other in the self, and effective conflict resolution strategies (voice) and significantly negatively correlated with ineffective conflict resolution strategies (exit, neglect, and loyalty), as well as anxious and avoidant attachment. A complementary pattern of results was found for perceived partner *insensitivity,* which was significantly negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction, inclusion of other in the self, and effective conflict resolution strategies (voice), while significantly positively correlated with ineffective conflict resolution strategies (exit, neglect, and loyalty) and anxious and avoidant attachment. Notably, similar patterns emerged for both the PRIS-SA and the brief PRIS-SA versions, as we conducted identical analyses for both versions.

Discussion

Perceived partner responsiveness is a core construct in relationship science, closely linked with pro-relationship behaviors and positive relationship outcomes (Reis, 2012). The current study adapted the 16-item and 8-item versions of the PRIS to the Spanish language (PRIS-SA) and provided validity evidence. The PRIS-SA demonstrated adequate psychometric properties that mirror those of the original version, including a clear two-factor structure, adequate internal consistency, gender invariance and, consistent with existing literature, exhibited validity evidence when the PRIS-SA was associated with relationship satisfaction, partner inclusion in the self, conflict resolution strategies and attachment orientations. However, some limitation to this study must be noted. First, the PRIS-SA has been adapted for use in the

context of romantic relationships, where the perceived partner responsiveness construct has been extensively studied. Future research should test the 8 and 16-item versions in other relationships (e.g., patient-doctor, close friendships, family). Second, while the PRIS has been adapted for the Spanish culture and linguistic context of Spain, variations in the Spanish language exist across countries and regions. Therefore, researchers using this measure should review the items drawing from an adaptation method and provide some validity evidence to ensure that the inferences drawn are as applicable as those using the Spanish version tailored for Spain. Finally, we did not collect data on participants' race/ethnicity, disability status, or detailed student characteristics (20.3% of the sample), which limits the generalizability of our findings to other demographic groups. Overall, the field of relationship science will benefit from increased efforts to develop methods and tools that will allow participation from more diverse groups in our research.

References

Algoe, S.B., & Zhaoyang, R. (2016). Positive psychology in context: Effects of expressing gratitude in ongoing relationships depend on perceptions of enactor responsiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(4), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1117131

Alonso-Ferres, M., Righetti, F., Valor-Segura, I., & Expósito, F. (2021). How power affects emotional communication during relationship conflicts: The role of perceived partner responsiveness. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *12*(7), 1203–1215. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550621996496

Aron, A., Aron, E.N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*(4), 596–612. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596

Cheung, G.W., & Rensvold, R.B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 9*(2), 233–255. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5

Choi, H., & Oishi, S. (2023). Cultural variations in perceived partner responsiveness: The role of self-consistency. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *54*(2), 303–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221132786

Crasta, D., Rogge, R.D., Maniaci, M.R., & Reis, H.T. (2021). Toward an optimized measure of perceived partner responsiveness: Development and validation of the perceived responsiveness and insensitivity scale. *Psychological Assessment*, *33*(4), 338–355. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000986

Finkel, E.J., Simpson, J.A., & Eastwick, P.W. (2017). The psychology of close relationships: Fourteen core principles. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *68*(1), 383–411. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044038

Gadassi, R., Bar-Nahum, L.E., Newhouse, S., Anderson, R., Heiman, J. R., Rafaeli, E., & Janssen, E. (2016). Perceived partner responsiveness mediates the association between sexual and marital satisfaction: A daily diary study in newlywed couples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *45*(1), 109–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-014-0448-2

Gunaydin, G., Selcuk, E., Urganci, B., & Yalcintas, S. (2021). Today you care, tomorrow you don't: Differential roles of responsiveness variability and average responsiveness in romantic attachment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *12*(5), 839–849. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620944111

Guzmán-González, M., Rivera-Ottenberger, D., Brassard, A., Spencer, R., & Lafontaine, M.-F. (2020). Measuring adult romantic attachment: Psychometric properties of the brief Spanish version of the experiences in close relationships. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, *33*(9). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-020-00145-w

Hambleton, R.K., & de Jong, J.H.A.L. (2003). Advances in translating and adapting educational and psychological tests. *Language Testing*, *20*(2), 127–134. https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532203lt247xx

Harkness, J.A. (2003). Questionnaire translation. In J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. van de Vijver, & P. P. Mohler (Eds.), *Cross-cultural survey methods* (pp. 35–56). J. Wiley & Sons.

Hendershot, Q.E. (2022). *'El Grado De Felicidad' o 'Cuan Feliz Se Encuentra': Improving Spanish Translations of Relationship Measures*. Binghamton University.

Laurenceau, J.-P., Barrett, L.F., & Rovine, M.J. (2005). The interpersonal process model of intimacy in marriage: A daily-diary and multilevel modeling approach. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *19*(2), 314–323. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.314

Maisel, N.C., & Gable, S.L. (2009). The paradox of received social support: The importance of responsiveness. *Psychological Science*, *20*(8), 928–932. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02388.x

Pansera, C., & La Guardia, J. (2012). The role of sincere amends and perceived partner responsiveness in forgiveness. *Personal Relationships*, *19*(4), 696–711. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2011.01386.x

Reis, H.T. (2012). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing theme for the study of relationships and well-being. In *Interdisciplinary research on close relationships: The case for integration* (pp. 27–52). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13486-002

Valor-Segura, I., Garrido-Macías, M., & Lozano, L.M. (2020). Adaptation of the Accommodation among Romantic Couples Scale (ARCS) to the Spanish population. *Psichothema*, *32*(1), 145–152. https://doi.org/doi: 10.7334/psicothema2019.123

Williamson, H.C., Bornstein, J.X., Cantu, V., Ciftci, O., Farnish, K.A., & Schouweiler, M.T. (2022). How diverse are the samples used to study intimate relationships? A systematic review. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *39*(4), 1087–1109. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211053849

Wu, D.C., Kim, H.S., & Collins, N.L. (2021). Perceived responsiveness across cultures: The role of cultural fit in social support use. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *15*(9), e12634. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12634

Table 1. *Final Items of The Perceived Responsiveness and Insensitivity Scale - Spanish Adaptation (PRIS-SA), Descriptive Statistic and Factor Structure*

	Descriptive Statistic			Factor Structure			
				PRIS-SA		Brief PRIS-SA	
Category indicator/item text	*M*(*SD*)	Skewness	Kurtosis	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Responsiveness							
*Mi pareja me escucha de verdad	3.63(1.18)	-0.71	0.09	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
*Mi pareja muestra interés por lo que pienso y siento	3.68(1.20)	-0.80	0.19	1.05	0.04	1.02	0.04
*Mi pareja es comprensiva	3.73(1.13)	-0.78	0.23	0.97	0.04	0.95	0.05
*Mi pareja intenta ponerse en mi lugar	3.20(1.44)	-0.59	-0.52	1.17	0.05	1.14	0.05
Mi pareja está atenta a mis necesidades	3.60(1.27)	-0.78	-0.01	1.03	0.05		
Mi pareja responde a mis necesidades	3.70(1.17)	-0.71	-0.06	1.01	0.04		
Mi pareja entiende mi punto de vista de verdad	3.44(1.29)	-0.64	-0.32	1.11	0.04		
Mi pareja se toma en serio mis preocupaciones	3.71(1.29)	-0.86	-0.03	1.08	0.05		
Insensitivity							
*Mi pareja NO reconoce mis sentimientos y preocupaciones	1.26(1.47)	0.96	-0.19	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
*Mi pareja ignora mi versión de los hechos	0.76(1.14)	1.76	3.01	1.06	0.13	1.24	0.17
*Mi pareja parece ignorar las cosas que son más importantes para mí	0.72(1.11)	1.77	3.05	1.07	0.15	1.19	0.19
*Mi pareja subestima mis preocupaciones con demasiada facilidad	0.94(1.24)	1.40	1.40	1.27	0.15	1.27	0.16
Mi pareja NO se toma tan en serio mis preocupaciones	0.85(1.20)	1.45	1.49	1.23	0.12		
Cuando estoy preocupado/a o estresado/a por algo, contárselo a mi pareja solo empeora las cosas	0.50(1.01)	2.49	6.35	0.82	0.15		
Mi pareja NO suele escuchar realmente lo que digo	0.70(1.11)	1.81	3.14	1.12	0.13		
Mi pareja NO entiende del todo mis deseos y necesidades	1.15(1.38)	1.18	0.59	1.04	0.12		
Correlations between subscale totals				*r*	*p*	*r*	*p*
				-0.51	<.001	-0.50	<.001

Note. Items marked with a star are used in the brief PRIS-SA scale. Spanish response options are: 0 (Nada en absoluto), 1 (Un poco), 2 (Ligeramente), 3 (Bastante), 4 (Mucho), 5 (Complentamente).

Table 2.

CFA Fit Indices for Competitive Models.

Models	χ^2	Df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA [90%IC]	SRMR
PRIS-SA						
M1	257.15***	103	.96	.95	.064[0.05, 0.07]	.05
M2	477.52***	104	.89	.88	.099[0.09, 0.11]	.07
M3	259.67***	102	.95	.94	.069 [0.06, 0.05]	.15
Brief PRIS-SA						
M1	34.37**	19	.99	.99	.034[0.01, 0.06]	.02
M2	118.04***	20	.94	.92	.084[0.07, 0.10]	.06
M3	34.38**	18	.99	.99	.038 [0.00, 0.06]	.13

Note. M1= original model of two correlated factors—responsiveness and insensitivity); M2= unidimensional model; M3= two factors—responsiveness and insensitivity—nested into a second-order factor. ***p* <.01; ****p* <.001

Table 3.

Fit Indices and Comparison of Invariance Models

Models	χ^2	Df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA[90% IC]	ΔCFI	ΔRMSEA
PRIS-SA							
Configural Invariance	411.74***	206	.938	.928	.078[0.070, 0.087]	-	
Metric Invariance	427.11***	220	.938	.932	.067[0.084, 0.059]	.000	.011
Scalar Invariance	450.55***	234	.936	.934	.074[0.066, 0.082]	.002	-.007
Strict Invariance	436.52***	250	.932	.935	.074[0.066, 0.082]	.004	.000
Brief PRIS-SA							
Configural Invariance	68.70**	38	.984	.977	.058[0.035, 0.079]	-	
Metric Invariance	73.16**	44	.985	.981	.052[0.030, 0.073]	-.001	.006
Scalar Invariance	91.22***	50	.979	.976	.058[0.039, 0.077]	.006	-.006
Strict Invariance	115.20***	58	.971	.972	.064[0.046, 0.081]	.008	-.006

Note. **p <.01;***p <.001

Table 4.

Correlations between PRIS-SA Subscales and Relevant Variables

		Responsiveness		Insensitivity	
		PRIS-SA	Brief PRIS-SA	PRIS-SA	Brief PRIS-SA
Relationship satisfaction		.76 [0.72, 0.79]	.74 [0.69, 0.78]	-.52 [-0.58, -0.45]	-.48 [-0.55, -0.42]
Inclusion of the other in the self		.41 [0.34, 0.48]	.38 [0.30, 0.45]	-.25 [-0.33, -0.17]	-.24 [-0.32, -0.16]
Conflict resolution strategies	Exit	-.43 [-0.50, -0.36]	-.41 [-0.48, -0.33]	.33 [0.25, 0.40]	.30 [0.22, 0.38]
	Voice	.35 [0.27, 0.43]	.34 [0.26, 0.42]	-.28 [-0.35, -0.19]	-.23 [-0.31, -0.15]
	Loyalty	-.20 [-0.28, -0.11]	-.19 [-0.28, -0.11]	.17 [0.08, 0.25]	.18 [0.09, 0.26]
	Neglect	-.44 [-0.50, -0.36]	-.44 [-0.50, -0.36]	.36 [0.28, 0.43]	.34 [0.26, 0.41]
Attachment	Anxious	-.33 [-0.41, -0.25]	-.31 [-0.39, -0.23]	.33 [0.25, 0.41]	.31 [0.23, 0.39]
	Avoidance	-.53 [-0.59, -0.47]	-.52 [-0.58, -0.45]	.47 [0.40, 0.54]	.44 [0.36, 0.51]

Note. Confidence intervals that do not contain zero indicate that the correlations are significant ($p < .05$).