Supplementary materials

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

Samples 1-5 were recruited online for the study on personality functioning in general population. They volunteered to participate in the study in response to advertisements on the Internet and at the university department. Data from online samples were collected anonymously, after obtaining informed consent through a separate form. It is worth noting, that although sample one (n = 99) and two (n = 27) were derived from the general population, 32% of individuals in these groups sought psychological and psychiatric assistance in the year previous to the study, what means that some of them may have experienced distress and interpersonal problems. Samples three (n = 38), four (n = 57), and five (n = 103) were members of a Facebook group, self-identified as depressed, where they shared daily concerns and experiences related to depression. For the purposes of our study, these participants were categorized by the severity of their actual depressive symptoms. Despite experiencing difficulties, some may have learned about their depression diagnosis from a professional, and some may not have been diagnosed at all. Moreover, participants were not screened for PDs but research consistently shows relatively high rates of comorbidity between depression and PDs have been observed (e.g., Fava et al., 2002).

The last sample, six, encompassed PD patients from general psychiatric ward, who stayed there for an average of four weeks and agreed to participate in the scientific study in addition to their standard PD diagnosis. The study was conducted by a psychologist employed at the ward. Data from the clinical sample were anonymized by the data collector prior to digitization. The provision of services was not contingent upon their participation to the study.

All individuals from sample 6 received a psychiatric diagnosis of PD, made by psychologists based on ICD-10 criteria. The exclusion criteria for the participation were as follows: schizophrenia, other chronic delusional disorders, organic-related disorders, a his-

Table S1

Characteristics of participants by sample

Sample	Description	N	% women	M_{age}	SD_{age}
1	Without pharmacotherapy and/or psychotherapy	99	84.8	32.9	10.1
2	With pharmacotherapy and/or psychotherapy	47	83.0	33.8	8.7
3	Without current episode of depression	38	71.1	25.2	5.6
4	Episode of mild and moderate depression	57	87.7	29.6	9.4
5	Episode of severe depression	103	93.2	29.4	10.4
6	Personality disorders	50	64.0	32.6	8.3
Total		394	83.2	30.9	9.6

Table S2

Descriptive statistics and reliability of subscales for the Polish adaptation of the Self and Interpersonal Functioning Scale (N = 394)

SIFS	M	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω	Skewness	Kurtosis
Identity	2.08	1.00	.84	.86	−0.19	−1.17
Self-direction	1.83	0.87	.68	.67	0.05	−0.65
Empathy	1.26	0.81	.70	.70	0.73	0.04
Intimacy	1.42	0.96	.79	.79	0.41	−0.74
Self	1.97	0.87	.87	–	−0.18	−1.06
Interpersonal	1.34	0.81	.85	–	0.48	−0.50
Total	1.66	0.78	.91		0.71	−0.91

tory of excessive alcohol consumption or substance use within a month preceding the study, and an inability (e.g., cognitive) to complete the questionnaire. The clinical group included 8 individuals diagnosed with Borderline PD (F60.3), 2 with Dissocial PD (F60.2), 3 with Other Specific Disorders – Narcissistic (F60.8), 1 with Paranoid PD (F60.0), and 35 with Mixed and Other PDs (F61). All patients had comorbid clinical syndromes, most frequently current or past substance abuse, depression, or other emotional issues. This profile is quite typical of the clinical population in the Polish public healthcare system.

Participants did not receive compensation for participating in the study. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments.

ELABORATION OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION 1

Considering research on scales measuring Criterion A components of DSM-5 AMPD, the results regarding the latent structure of Criterion A vary somewhat, depending on the instruments used and the analytic approach. Zimmermann and colleagues (2019) initially argued in their comprehensive review on the AMPD that the most appropriate model to date for the latent structure of level of personality functioning subdomains involves two strongly correlated self and interpersonal functioning factors. For the Level of Personality Functioning Scale-Brief Form 2.0 (LPFS-BF 2.0; Weekers et al., 2019; Łakuta et al., 2023b, for the Polish adaptation), confirmatory factor analyses demonstrated that a two-factor solution had a better fit than unidimensional models. Zimmermann et al. (2015) have recently argued that a strong common factor underly measures of personality impairment, which can be scaled along a single latent continuum. This proposition is also compatible with recent results from a study (e.g., Uliaszek et al., 2023) in which different models (one-factor, four-factor, higher-order, and bifactor models) were tested using the Level of Personality Functioning Scale-Self Report (LPFS-SR; Morey, 2017); results supported a bifactor solution. In the Polish adaptation of the LPFS-SR (Łakuta et al., 2023a), the four Criterion A elements were best characterized by a single global factor (e.g., Hopwood et al., 2018). Conversely, using a different analytic approach (i.e., bass-ackwards factor analysis on items from multiple personality impairment self-report questionnaires), Sleep et al. (2024) reported that the meta-structure of personality dysfunction comprises four factors aligned with the Criterion A.

Our own results on the SIFS-PL could be seen as a compromise between these perspectives. We could speculate that the bifactor solution (Model 5) might explain the most variance (low RMSEA), indicating that there were potentially two sources of variance in SIFS results – one arising from the general factor (common variance), and the other from individual, somewhat distinct content-related factors that might capture unique variance that however do clearly correspond to the scales of Identity, Self-direction, Intimacy and Empathy. However, based on CFI the four scale higher order model can be treated as conformed.

Generally, the results imply that we did not completely reject the model proposing a general factor for Criterion A (as suggested by Hopwood et al., 2018), yet we have demonstrated its complexity (as seen in the misfit of Model 1 in our study). This indicates the need to work with two groups of results – the general and the subscales – as we can expect somewhat different functioning of results for such nuanced constructs. The overall score reflects theoretically justified interconnections between personality elements demonstrating the uniformity of the construct, and sub-scales relate to the individual configurations of impairments in selected areas, when the relatedness and self-definition could not develop in a harmonious way (e.g., Morey, 2017; Luyten & Blatt, 2013). Further validation studies should help determine which solution should be applied for specific purposes (e.g., for screening, case conceptualization or psychotherapy outcome monitoring). This is because it is not a simple hierarchy, and it reminds us of the complexity of conceptualizing personality disorders – neither focusing solely on the level of personality pathology nor on the selected set (and intensity) of pathological traits is sufficient for understanding them.

Additional references

Hopwood, C. J., Good, E. W., & Morey, L. C. (2018). Validity of the DSM-5 Levels of Personality Functioning Scale-Self Report. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 100*, 650–659. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1420660

Luyten, P., & Blatt, S. J. (2013). Interpersonal relatedness and self-definition in normal and disrupted personality development: Retrospect and prospect. *American Psychologist, 68*, 172–183. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032243

Uliaszek, A. A., Amestoy, M. E., Fournier, M. A., & Al-Dajani, N. (2023). Criterion A of the alternative model of personality disorders: Structure and validity in a community sample. *Psychological Assessment, 35*, 453–461. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0001225

Weekers, L. C., Hutsebaut, J., & Kamphuis, J. H. (2019). The Level of Personality Functioning Scale-Brief Form 2.0: Update of a brief instrument for assessing level of personality functioning. *Personality and*

Mental Health, 13, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmh.1434

Zimmermann, J., Böhnke, J. R., Eschstruth, R., Mathews, A., Wenzel, K., & Leising, D. (2015). The latent structure of personality functioning: Investigating criterion A from the alternative model for personality disorders in DSM-5. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 124*, 532–548. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000059

Zimmermann, J., Kerber, A., Rek, K., Hopwood, C. J., & Krueger, R. F. (2019). A brief but comprehensive review of research on the alternative DSM-5 model for personality disorders. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 21*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-1079-z

ELABORATION OF THE DISCUSSION SECTION 2

There is an ongoing debate concerning the issue of the overlap and potential redundancy of Criterion A and B. Substantial correlations exist between maladaptive traits and core personality dysfunctions (e.g., Hentschel & Pukrop, 2014; Morey et al., 2022). Our findings align with those from Marti Valls and colleagues (2023), who demonstrated that when using brief self-report tools for Criterion A and B, there is an overlap of over 50% between both criteria. Zimmerman and colleagues (2015) provided support for the partial distinctness of Criterion A from the five factors of Criterion B and advocated for further conceptual distinction (elaborated upon by Sharp & Wall, 2021). These outcomes are leading some researchers to posit that Criterion A and B might be redundant and superfluous. Nevertheless, others contend that Criteria A and B are distinct and essential. The latter viewpoint emphasizes the conceptual distinctiveness (developmental and interpersonal theories versus trait theories) of the criteria, which contributed to the introduction of these two dimensions into the AMPD. For instance, the level of personality functioning (Criterion A) can be linked to the level of personality organization (Kernberg, 2012), and its components (identity, self-direction, empathy, and intimacy) may reflect developmental achievements in terms of mental representations' growth (e.g., differentiation and integration). Criterion A seems to offer unique information about daily personality functioning (e.g., Heiland & Veilleux, 2021). Criterion A impairments are conceptualized in terms of regulatory and relational processes that involve the self and others. Identity, self-direction, empathy, and intimacy represent not merely descriptive features but also depict processes that play significant roles in everyday life, contributing to the fulfillment of needs, goals, and psychosocial functioning (Buer Christensen et al., 2020). When considering personality traits (Criterion B), individual differences provide crucial insights into the contexts that evoke personality impairments and the styles of their expression, thereby distinguishing various types of personality disorders across patients (Pincus et al., 2020).

In the discussion on the relationship between Criteria A and B, it is necessary to pay attention to the issues of methods. Criterion A and B may appear redundant but not because of a theoretical problem but very likely due to the constraints of self-report questionnaires used for both Criteria (e.g., Burchett et al., 2023; Natoli & Bornstein, 2019) and overuse of cross-sectional research designs. Besides, Waugh and colleagues (2021) suggest that self-report measures for Criterion A are not "gold standards" because of the nature of the level of personality functioning. Many symptoms of personality disorders are ego-syntonic and self-report is often under the influence of distorted self and other perceptions resulting in low insight – although recent works suggest that individuals with pathological personality traits may possess more insight into their actual trait levels and functional impairment than previously thought. Nonetheless, it remains crucial to refine self-report methods and understand what type of information about personality functioning they actually convey (in line with the concept that validity research should transcend conventional validation protocols; see, e.g., Waugh et al., 2021). This extends to large-scale studies, screening endeavors, and user-friendly self-report tools in individual diagnosis.

Further research directions in the validation of SIFS (both in general and more specifically for its Polish adaptation) include, among others: 1) examination of the invariance of the SIFS' structure across cultural adaptations; 2) investigating its predictive validity for both general and subscale scores; 3) examining its criterion validity by further assessing, following Macina et al.'s (2023) favorable results on the matter, the correspondence between SIFS scores and methods of expert clinical diagnosis (e.g., clinical interviews); 4) improving its discriminant validity (most notably with Criterion B); and 5) exploring cut-off scores for clinical assessment of the severity of personality pathology (or level of personality functioning) within the Polish sample (e.g., Gamache et al., 2021), with the aim of reinforcing its clinical utility.

Additional references

Burchett, D., Sellbom, M., & Bagby, R. M. (2023). Assessment of response bias in personality disorder research. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 14*, 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000608

Heiland, A. M., & Veilleux, J. C. (2021). Severity of personality dysfunction predicts affect and self-

efficacy in daily life. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 12*, 560–569. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000470

Kernberg, O. F. (2012). Overview and critique of the classification of personality disorders proposed for DSM-V. *Schweizer Archiv Für Neurologie Und Psychiatrie, 163*, 234–238. https://doi.org/10.4414/sanp.2012.00110

Martí Valls, C., Balazadeh, K., & Kajonius, P. (2023). Investigating the overlap and predictive validity between Criterion A and B in the alternative model for personality disorders in DSM-5. *International Journal of Testing, 23*, 190–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2023.2195661

Natoli, A. P., & Bornstein, R. F. (2019). *Validating the Level of Personality Functioning Scale: We don't use multimethod research designs* [Preprint]. PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/nhrd2

Pincus, A. L., Cain, N. M., & Halberstadt, A. L. (2020). Importance of self and other in defining personality pathology. *Psychopathology, 53*, 133–140. https://doi.org/10.1159/000506313

Table S3

Item loadings for Model 1

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
SIFS2	0.629	0.035	17.789	< .001
SIFS1	−0.659	0.031	−21.585	< .001
SIFS3	0.855	0.018	47.450	< .001
SIFS4	0.642	0.033	19.762	< .001
SIFS5	0.871	0.016	55.560	< .001
SIFS6	−0.141	0.048	−2.949	.003
SIFS7	0.871	0.018	48.393	< .001
SIFS8	−0.616	0.033	−18.468	< .001
SIFS9	0.614	0.033	18.665	< .001
SIFS10	0.370	0.043	8.577	< .001
SIFS11	0.599	0.034	17.789	< .001
SIFS12	−0.519	0.039	−13.163	< .001
SIFS13	0.646	0.031	20.567	< .001
SIFS14	0.555	0.039	14.259	< .001
SIFS15	0.712	0.026	26.898	< .001
SIFS16	0.402	0.047	8.539	< .001
SIFS17	−0.287	0.046	−6.170	< .001
SIFS18	0.413	0.042	9.864	< .001
SIFS19	−0.654	0.031	−21.348	< .001
SIFS20	0.650	0.035	18.454	< .001
SIFS21	0.402	0.045	8.864	< .001
SIFS22	0.716	0.030	23.471	< .001
SIFS23	0.738	0.028	26.456	< .001
SIFS24	−0.654	0.032	−20.558	< .001

Table S4

Item loadings for Model 2

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
Self				
SIFS2	0.648	0.036	18.140	< .001
SIFS1	−0.680	0.030	−22.309	< .001
SIFS3	0.875	0.018	49.336	< .001
SIFS4	0.665	0.033	20.073	< .001
SIFS5	0.891	0.015	58.847	< .001
SIFS6	−0.145	0.050	−2.917	.004
SIFS7	0.889	0.017	51.008	< .001
SIFS8	−0.639	0.034	−19.001	< .001
SIFS9	0.638	0.033	19.044	< .001
SIFS10	0.385	0.044	8.664	< .001
SIFS11	0.621	0.034	18.034	< .001
SIFS12	−0.536	0.040	−13.302	< .001
Inter				
SIFS13	0.684	0.032	21.580	< .001
SIFS14	0.589	0.039	14.999	< .001
SIFS15	0.758	0.027	28.089	< .001
SIFS16	0.431	0.048	8.952	< .001
SIFS17	−0.306	0.048	−6.360	< .001
SIFS18	0.438	0.043	10.167	< .001
SIFS19	−0.690	0.031	−22.536	< .001
SIFS20	0.691	0.036	19.129	< .001
SIFS21	0.425	0.047	9.060	< .001
SIFS22	0.759	0.031	24.551	< .001
SIFS23	0.784	0.028	28.146	< .001
SIFS24	−0.692	0.032	−21.814	< .001

Table S5

Item loadings for Model 3

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
IDENTITY				
SIFS2	0.654	0.036	18.310	< .001
SIFS1	−0.687	0.031	−22.474	< .001
SIFS3	0.880	0.017	50.786	< .001
SIFS4	0.672	0.033	20.302	< .001
SIFS5	0.897	0.015	60.393	< .001
SIFS6	−0.147	0.050	−2.916	.004
SIFS7	0.895	0.017	51.806	< .001
SELF DIR				
SIFS9	0.669	0.034	19.429	< .001
SIFS8	−0.667	0.036	−18.525	< .001
SIFS10	0.404	0.046	8.769	< .001
SIFS11	0.650	0.036	18.171	< .001
SIFS12	−0.560	0.042	−13.239	< .001
EMPATHY				
SIFS13	0.737	0.032	23.331	< .001
SIFS14	0.633	0.040	15.633	< .001
SIFS15	0.821	0.029	28.126	< .001
SIFS16	0.461	0.051	9.093	< .001
SIFS17	−0.326	0.051	−6.393	< .001
SIFS18	0.471	0.045	10.506	< .001
INTIM				
SIFS20	0.714	0.036	19.716	< .001
SIFS19	−0.713	0.030	−23.531	< .001
SIFS21	0.436	0.049	8.924	< .001
SIFS22	0.782	0.031	25.145	< .001
SIFS23	0.811	0.029	28.438	< .001
SIFS24	−0.714	0.031	−22.797	< .001

Table S6

Item loadings for Model 4

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
IDENT				
SIFS2	0.655	0.036	18.297	< .001
SIFS1	−0.687	0.031	−22.329	< .001
SIFS3	0.879	0.017	50.905	< .001
SIFS4	0.672	0.033	20.334	< .001
SIFS5	0.898	0.015	60.268	< .001
SIFS6	−0.147	0.050	−2.924	.003
SIFS7	0.896	0.017	51.759	< .001
SD				
SIFS9	0.668	0.034	19.398	< .001
SIFS8	−0.667	0.036	−18.441	< .001
SIFS10	0.401	0.046	8.722	< .001
SIFS11	0.651	0.036	18.196	< .001
SIFS12	−0.561	0.042	−13.236	< .001
EMPATHY				
SIFS13	0.739	0.032	23.366	< .001
SIFS14	0.633	0.041	15.507	< .001
SIFS15	0.821	0.029	28.183	< .001
SIFS16	0.459	0.051	8.954	< .001
SIFS17	−0.324	0.051	−6.299	< .001
SIFS18	0.472	0.045	10.462	< .001
INTIM				
SIFS20	0.714	0.036	19.679	< .001
SIFS19	−0.713	0.030	−23.482	< .001
SIFS21	0.434	0.049	8.854	< .001
SIFS22	0.783	0.031	25.085	< .001
SIFS23	0.811	0.029	28.263	< .001
SIFS24	−0.714	0.031	−22.790	< .001
IDENT	0.914	0.018	49.844	< .001
SD	0.939	0.025	38.057	< .001
EMPATH	0.860	0.025	34.999	< .001
INTIM	0.867	0.020	44.080	< .001

Table S7

Item loadings for Model 5

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
FG				
SIFS1	−0.641	0.040	−15.937	< .001
SIFS2	0.624	0.040	15.467	< .001
SIFS3	0.842	0.026	32.423	< .001
SIFS4	0.651	0.035	18.804	< .001
SIFS5	0.857	0.024	36.060	< .001
SIFS6	−0.130	0.050	−2.591	.010
SIFS7	0.856	0.023	36.657	< .001
SIFS8	−0.595	0.040	−14.943	< .001
SIFS9	0.628	0.034	18.343	< .001
SIFS10	0.390	0.046	8.539	< .001
SIFS11	0.613	0.038	16.332	< .001
SIFS12	−0.506	0.042	−11.973	< .001
SIFS13	0.667	0.037	17.991	< .001
SIFS14	0.548	0.045	12.224	< .001
SIFS15	0.730	0.028	26.472	< .001
SIFS16	0.380	0.067	5.656	< .001
SIFS17	−0.256	0.056	−4.605	< .001
SIFS18	0.418	0.053	7.811	< .001
SIFS19	−0.597	0.041	−14.650	< .001
SIFS20	0.653	0.038	17.288	< .001
SIFS21	0.402	0.054	7.495	< .001
SIFS22	0.727	0.035	20.715	< .001
SIFS23	0.742	0.029	25.738	< .001
SIFS24	−0.587	0.040	−14.519	< .001

Table S7 continues

Table S7

Table S7 continued

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
F1				
SIFS1	0.284	0.058	4.860	< .001
SIFS2	−0.045	0.051	−0.886	.375
SIFS3	−0.030	0.037	−0.809	.419
SIFS4	0.097	0.056	1.732	.083
SIFS5	−0.049	0.038	−1.285	.199
SIFS6	0.158	0.063	2.508	.012
SIFS7	−0.152	0.047	−3.244	.001
SIFS8	0.575	0.060	9.615	< .001
SIFS9	0.055	0.053	1.037	.300
SIFS10	0.072	0.053	1.359	.174
SIFS11	−0.058	0.048	−1.211	.226
SIFS12	0.320	0.051	6.261	< .001
SIFS13	0.338	0.059	5.744	< .001
SIFS14	0.186	0.067	2.766	.006
SIFS15	0.213	0.056	3.799	< .001
SIFS16	−0.021	0.023	−0.917	.359
SIFS17	0.315	0.070	4.518	< .001
SIFS18	0.026	0.026	1.002	.316
SIFS19	0.016	0.034	0.482	.630
SIFS20	0.025	0.050	0.495	.620
SIFS21	−0.010	0.054	−0.185	.853
SIFS22	0.143	0.078	1.822	.068
SIFS23	0.152	0.057	2.677	.007
SIFS24	0.014	0.028	0.510	.610

Table S7 continues

Table S7

Table S7 continued

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
F2				
SIFS1	0.154	0.079	1.943	.052
SIFS2	−0.223	0.077	−2.894	.004
SIFS3	−0.231	0.079	−2.914	.004
SIFS4	−0.167	0.072	−2.324	.020
SIFS5	−0.243	0.077	−3.153	.002
SIFS6	−0.019	0.056	−0.341	.733
SIFS7	−0.171	0.083	−2.068	.039
SIFS8	0.001	0.029	0.044	.965
SIFS9	−0.047	0.063	−0.748	.455
SIFS10	0.057	0.059	0.966	.334
SIFS11	0.115	0.066	1.726	.084
SIFS12	−0.122	0.063	−1.943	.052
SIFS13	0.197	0.093	2.113	.035
SIFS14	0.318	0.072	4.414	< .001
SIFS15	−0.043	0.069	−0.622	.534
SIFS16	0.553	0.073	7.584	< .001
SIFS17	−0.418	0.059	−7.083	< .001
SIFS18	0.486	0.099	4.915	< .001
SIFS19	0.017	0.037	0.471	.637
SIFS20	0.155	0.056	2.746	.006
SIFS21	0.315	0.067	4.703	< .001
SIFS22	0.002	0.034	0.067	.947
SIFS23	0.027	0.044	0.616	.538
SIFS24	−0.009	0.027	−0.324	.746

Table S7 continues

Table S7

Table S7 continued

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
F3				
SIFS1	0.122	0.053	2.293	.022
SIFS2	0.042	0.048	0.892	.373
SIFS3	0.054	0.053	1.036	.300
SIFS4	0.120	0.060	1.996	.046
SIFS5	0.131	0.058	2.265	.023
SIFS6	0.165	0.060	2.749	.006
SIFS7	0.157	0.051	3.080	.002
SIFS8	−0.001	0.026	−0.033	.974
SIFS9	0.276	0.052	5.294	< .001
SIFS10	0.347	0.048	7.255	< .001
SIFS11	0.329	0.051	6.485	< .001
SIFS12	0.088	0.049	1.784	.074
SIFS13	−0.019	0.028	−0.669	.503
SIFS14	−0.080	0.054	−1.487	.137
SIFS15	−0.037	0.043	−0.871	.384
SIFS16	0.061	0.041	1.489	.136
SIFS17	0.153	0.065	2.349	.019
SIFS18	0.056	0.042	1.335	.182
SIFS19	0.612	0.047	13.071	< .001
SIFS20	−0.130	0.050	−2.618	.009
SIFS21	0.107	0.058	1.847	.065
SIFS22	−0.028	0.030	−0.916	.360
SIFS23	−0.113	0.044	−2.598	.009
SIFS24	0.612	0.046	13.415	< .001

Table S7 continues

Table S7

Table S7 continued

Item	Loadings	*SE*	*t*-test	*p*
F4				
SIFS1	0.138	0.067	2.055	.040
SIFS2	−0.127	0.067	−1.879	.060
SIFS3	−0.009	0.045	−0.206	.836
SIFS4	0.029	0.056	0.515	.607
SIFS5	0.055	0.044	1.252	.211
SIFS6	0.040	0.062	0.638	.523
SIFS7	−0.010	0.039	−0.252	.801
SIFS8	−0.011	0.049	−0.216	.829
SIFS9	−0.048	0.060	−0.789	.430
SIFS10	0.016	0.060	0.259	.795
SIFS11	0.046	0.058	0.790	.429
SIFS12	−0.004	0.047	−0.079	.937
SIFS13	−0.170	0.081	−2.101	.036
SIFS14	0.042	0.070	0.597	.551
SIFS15	−0.183	0.068	−2.696	.007
SIFS16	0.315	0.099	3.168	.002
SIFS17	−0.003	0.030	−0.116	.908
SIFS18	−0.356	0.097	−3.686	< .001
SIFS19	0.022	0.031	0.717	.474
SIFS20	0.037	0.056	0.662	.508
SIFS21	−0.044	0.081	−0.543	.587
SIFS22	0.486	0.076	6.365	< .001
SIFS23	0.129	0.057	2.268	.023
SIFS24	−0.121	0.055	−2.187	.029