# How to Find and Use Pearson Correlation Critical Values


Authored by

**stats writer**



March 1, 2026





RECOMMENDED CITATION

stats writer (2026). *How to Find and Use Pearson Correlation Critical Values*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=133396

# Pearson Correlation Critical Values Table

The table below provides the **Pearson correlation critical values** necessary for evaluating the statistical significance of a correlation coefficient across various **significance levels** and **degrees of freedom**. In the context of **bivariate analysis**, it is essential to remember that the degrees of freedom are calculated as **df = n - 2**, where **n** represents the total number of paired data points within the **sample size**.

| | Significance Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1-tailed** | **0.05** | **0.025** | **0.01** | **0.005** |
| **2-tailed** | **0.1** | **0.05** | **0.02** | **0.01** |
| **df** | | | | |
| 1 | 0.988 | 0.997 | 0.9995 | 0.9999 |
| 2 | 0.9 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.99 |
| 3 | 0.805 | 0.878 | 0.934 | 0.959 |
| 4 | 0.729 | 0.811 | 0.882 | 0.917 |
| 5 | 0.669 | 0.754 | 0.833 | 0.874 |
| 6 | 0.622 | 0.707 | 0.789 | 0.834 |
| 7 | 0.582 | 0.666 | 0.75 | 0.798 |
| 8 | 0.549 | 0.632 | 0.716 | 0.765 |
| 9 | 0.521 | 0.602 | 0.685 | 0.735 |
| 10 | 0.497 | 0.576 | 0.658 | 0.708 |
| 11 | 0.476 | 0.553 | 0.634 | 0.684 |
| 12 | 0.458 | 0.532 | 0.612 | 0.661 |
| 13 | 0.441 | 0.514 | 0.592 | 0.641 |
| 14 | 0.426 | 0.497 | 0.574 | 0.628 |
| 15 | 0.412 | 0.482 | 0.558 | 0.606 |
| 16 | 0.4 | 0.468 | 0.542 | 0.59 |
| 17 | 0.389 | 0.456 | 0.528 | 0.575 |
| 18 | 0.378 | 0.444 | 0.516 | 0.561 |
| 19 | 0.369 | 0.433 | 0.503 | 0.549 |
| 20 | 0.36 | 0.423 | 0.492 | 0.537 |
| 21 | 0.352 | 0.413 | 0.482 | 0.526 |
| 22 | 0.344 | 0.404 | 0.472 | 0.515 |
| 23 | 0.337 | 0.396 | 0.462 | 0.505 |
| 24 | 0.33 | 0.388 | 0.453 | 0.495 |
| 25 | 0.323 | 0.381 | 0.445 | 0.487 |
| 26 | 0.317 | 0.374 | 0.437 | 0.479 |
| 27 | 0.311 | 0.367 | 0.43 | 0.471 |
| 28 | 0.306 | 0.361 | 0.423 | 0.463 |
| 29 | 0.301 | 0.355 | 0.416 | 0.456 |
| 30 | 0.296 | 0.349 | 0.409 | 0.449 |
| 35 | 0.275 | 0.325 | 0.381 | 0.418 |
| 40 | 0.257 | 0.304 | 0.358 | 0.393 |
| 45 | 0.243 | 0.288 | 0.338 | 0.372 |
| 50 | 0.231 | 0.273 | 0.322 | 0.354 |
| 60 | 0.211 | 0.25 | 0.295 | 0.325 |
| 70 | 0.195 | 0.232 | 0.274 | 0.302 |
| 80 | 0.183 | 0.217 | 0.256 | 0.284 |
| 90 | 0.173 | 0.205 | 0.242 | 0.267 |
| 100 | 0.164 | 0.195 | 0.23 | 0.254 |

## Understanding the Fundamentals of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient

The **Pearson correlation coefficient**, often symbolized as **r**, is a foundational metric in **inferential statistics** used to quantify the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two continuous variables. Developed by the pioneering statistician **Karl Pearson**, this coefficient ranges from -1.0 to +1.0, where values closer to the extremes indicate a stronger relationship. A positive value implies that as one variable increases, the other tends to increase as well, whereas a negative value indicates an inverse relationship where one variable decreases as the other increases.

Calculating the **Pearson correlation coefficient** involves measuring the **covariance** of the two variables and dividing it by the product of their **standard deviations**. This **standardization** process ensures that the resulting value is dimensionless, allowing researchers to compare relationships across different scales of measurement. However, simply obtaining a high or low **r** value is insufficient for making scientific claims; one must determine if the observed correlation is **statistically significant** or merely the result of **sampling error**.

In various academic disciplines such as **psychology**, **economics**, and **biology**, the **Pearson r** serves as a critical first step in **exploratory data analysis**. By identifying potential associations, researchers can generate **hypotheses** that lead to more complex **predictive modeling** or **experimental designs**. Despite its utility, it is vital to recognize that the **Pearson correlation coefficient** only measures linear associations, meaning that non-linear relationships might go undetected or be misrepresented if this tool is applied incorrectly.

## The Role of Critical Values in Statistical Hypothesis Testing

In the realm of **statistical hypothesis testing**, critical values act as the threshold that separates the region of rejection from the region where the **null hypothesis** is maintained. When a researcher calculates a correlation coefficient from a dataset, they are essentially asking whether the relationship observed in the sample is strong enough to infer that a similar relationship exists in the broader **population**. The **Pearson correlation critical values table** provides the specific numerical boundaries required to answer this question definitively.

The **null hypothesis** typically posits that there is no correlation between the variables ($r = 0$) in the population. To reject this hypothesis, the absolute value of the calculated **Pearson r** must exceed the critical value found in the table for a given **alpha level** and **degrees of freedom**. If the calculated value is greater than the critical value, the result is deemed **statistically significant**, suggesting that the observed relationship is unlikely to have occurred by chance alone under the assumptions of the test.

Using **critical values** ensures a standardized objective for decision-making in research. Without these benchmarks, interpreting a correlation coefficient would be subjective and prone to **researcher bias**. By adhering to established **statistical significance** criteria, the scientific community can maintain a high level of rigor and reproducibility, ensuring that only robust findings are promoted within the literature and applied to real-world problems.

## Calculating and Applying Degrees of Freedom

The concept of **degrees of freedom** is central to understanding how to use the **Pearson correlation critical values table** correctly. In the context of a **Pearson correlation**, the degrees of freedom represent the number of values in the final calculation of a statistic that are free to vary. For a correlation between two variables, the formula is **df = n - 2**, where **n** is the number of pairs of observations. This subtraction of two accounts for the two **means** (one for each variable) that must be estimated from the data to calculate the correlation.

As the **sample size** increases, the **degrees of freedom** also increase, which generally leads to a decrease in the **critical value** required to achieve **statistical significance**. This occurs because larger samples provide a more accurate estimate of the **population parameters**, reducing the uncertainty associated with the **sampling distribution**. Consequently, even a relatively small correlation can be significant if the sample size is sufficiently large, while a large correlation might fail to reach significance in a very small sample.

Correctly identifying the **degrees of freedom** is a mandatory step before looking up a value in any statistical table. Miscalculating this figure can lead to **Type I errors** (false positives) or **Type II errors** (false negatives). Researchers must be diligent in ensuring their **n** represents the actual number of complete pairs, as missing data points for either variable will reduce the effective sample size and subsequently the **degrees of freedom** available for the analysis.

## Navigating Alpha Levels and Significance Thresholds

The **significance level**, often denoted by the Greek letter **alpha ($\alpha$)**, represents the probability of rejecting the **null hypothesis** when it is actually true. Common thresholds include 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001. A significance level of 0.05 indicates a 5% risk of concluding that a correlation exists when there is no actual relationship in the population. Choosing a more stringent alpha, such as 0.01, reduces the likelihood of a **Type I error** but increases the difficulty of finding a **statistically significant** result.

The choice of an **alpha level** often depends on the field of study and the consequences of a false discovery. In **medical research** or **engineering**, where the cost of an error can be high, lower alpha levels are preferred. Conversely, in **exploratory social science** research, an alpha of 0.05 is the conventional standard. The **Pearson correlation critical values table** is structured to accommodate these different levels of risk, allowing researchers to choose the column that aligns with their specific **experimental design** and confidence requirements.

Furthermore, the **alpha level** is closely tied to the concept of **confidence intervals**. When a correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, it implies that the 95% **confidence interval** for the correlation coefficient does not include zero. This relationship highlights the mathematical consistency of **frequentist statistics**, where **p-values** and critical values provide a binary decision framework for interpreting the magnitude and reliability of observed data patterns.

## How to Read the Pearson Correlation Critical Values Table

Reading the **Pearson correlation critical values table** is a straightforward process once the **degrees of freedom** and **significance level** have been determined. Most tables are organized with the **degrees of freedom** (df) in the leftmost column and the **alpha levels** across the top row. To find the correct critical value, the user simply locates the row corresponding to their calculated **df** and moves across to the column representing their chosen **alpha level** (e.g., 0.05 or 0.01).

It is also important to distinguish between **one-tailed** and **two-tailed tests** when using the table. A **two-tailed test** is used when the researcher is looking for any correlation, whether positive or negative. A **one-tailed test** is used when the researcher has a specific prediction about the direction of the relationship (e.g., predicting only a positive correlation). Most tables provide different sets of critical values for these two scenarios, with **two-tailed** values generally being higher and thus more difficult to reach than **one-tailed** values for the same **alpha level**.

If the exact **degrees of freedom** for a study are not listed in the table--which often happens with larger samples--the most conservative approach is to use the next lowest **df** value available. This ensures that the **critical value** is slightly higher, maintaining the **statistical rigor** of the test by not overestimating the significance of the results. Modern **statistical software** has largely automated this process by providing exact **p-values**, but the table remains an essential pedagogical tool and a quick reference for manual calculations.

## Assumptions Required for Valid Correlation Analysis

Before relying on the **Pearson correlation critical values**, certain **parametric assumptions** must be met to ensure the validity of the results. The first assumption is **linearity**, meaning the relationship between the two variables must be reasonably linear. If the relationship is **curvilinear**, the **Pearson r** will underestimate the strength of the association, and the **critical values** may lead to incorrect conclusions regarding **statistical significance**.

The second major assumption is **normality**. Both variables should follow a **normal distribution**, especially when dealing with smaller sample sizes. While the **Pearson correlation** is somewhat robust to deviations from **normality** in large samples, significant **skewness** or **kurtosis** can distort the **p-values** and the reliability of the **critical value** comparison. Researchers often use **histograms** or **Q-Q plots** to visually inspect the distribution of their data before proceeding with the analysis.

Lastly, the data must exhibit **homoscedasticity**, which means the **variance** of the residuals should be constant across all levels of the independent variable. If the **variance** changes (a condition known as **heteroscedasticity**), the correlation coefficient may be unreliable. Ensuring these assumptions are met--or using **non-parametric** alternatives like **Spearman's rank correlation** if they are not--is crucial for maintaining the integrity of the **data analysis** process.

## Interpreting the Results: Comparison and Conclusion

Once the **calculated r** and the **critical r** have been identified, the final step in the analysis is the comparison. If the absolute value of the **calculated Pearson r** is greater than the **critical value** obtained from the table, the researcher rejects the **null hypothesis**. This leads to the conclusion that there is a **statistically significant** relationship between the variables at the specified **alpha level**. Conversely, if the **calculated r** is less than or equal to the **critical value**, the researcher fails to reject the **null hypothesis**, concluding that the data does not provide sufficient evidence of a correlation.

It is vital to communicate these findings with **precision**. A **significant** result does not necessarily mean the relationship is strong; it only means the relationship is likely not zero. For example, in a very large sample, a correlation of 0.10 might be **statistically significant**, but its practical importance or **effect size** (often measured by **r-squared** or the **coefficient of determination**) might be negligible. Therefore, reporting the **coefficient of determination** alongside the **p-value** provides a more holistic view of the data's **practical significance**.

Furthermore, researchers must avoid the common pitfall of assuming that a **significant correlation** implies **causation**. Correlation only measures how variables move together; it does not explain why. Potential **confounding variables** or **spurious correlations** could be the actual drivers of the observed relationship. The **Pearson correlation critical values table** is a tool for identifying associations, but **experimental control** and theoretical grounding are required to establish **causal links** between phenomena.

## Practical Applications in Social Sciences and Economics

The **Pearson correlation critical values table** finds extensive use in the **social sciences**, where researchers investigate complex human behaviors and societal trends. For instance, a **sociologist** might use the table to determine if there is a significant correlation between education levels and income across different demographic groups. By comparing their calculated **r** to the **critical**

**values**, they can support or refute theories regarding **social mobility** and economic inequality with **statistical evidence**.

In the field of **economics**, **econometricians** frequently use **Pearson r** to analyze the relationship between market indicators, such as the **consumer price index** and unemployment rates. The **critical values table** helps these professionals filter out noise in **time-series data**, ensuring that the trends they identify are robust enough to inform policy decisions or investment strategies. Without these **statistical benchmarks**, economic forecasts would lack the necessary **quantitative rigor** required for high-stakes decision-making.

Beyond these fields, the table is a staple in **educational research** and **public health**. Whether evaluating the effectiveness of a new teaching method by correlating study hours with test scores or examining the link between lifestyle factors and disease incidence, the **Pearson correlation** remains a primary tool. The ability to quickly reference **critical values** allows practitioners to validate their findings in real-time, facilitating a more **data-driven approach** to solving societal challenges and improving human outcomes.

## The Impact of Outliers on Correlation Significance

One of the most significant challenges when using the **Pearson correlation** is the influence of **outliers**. An outlier is a data point that differs significantly from other observations in the **sample**. Because the **Pearson r** is based on the **mean** and **standard deviation**, a single extreme value can disproportionately inflate or deflate the **correlation coefficient**, leading to a **statistically significant** result that does not accurately represent the majority of the data.

When an **outlier** is present, the **calculated r** might exceed the **critical value** from the table, prompting a rejection of the **null hypothesis**. However, this "significance" might be entirely driven by that one anomalous point rather than a consistent trend. Researchers must use **scatter plots** to visually identify such points before interpreting the **critical values**. In some cases, it may be appropriate to use **robust statistical methods** or to remove the outlier if it is determined to be a **measurement error**.

The phenomenon of **Anscombe's quartet** serves as a famous illustration of this issue, demonstrating four datasets with identical **summary statistics** (including **Pearson r** and **critical values**) but vastly different underlying distributions. This emphasizes that while the **Pearson correlation critical values table** is a powerful tool, it must be used in conjunction with **visual data inspection** and a deep understanding of the dataset's **context** to avoid misleading conclusions.