Factor Analysis

The sample factor analysis completed below utilizes a data set labeled CANSAS.LAZ. The canonical factor analysis method was used and the varimax rotation method was used.

Shown below is the factor analysis form selected by choosing the factor analysis option under the Statistics / Multivariate menu:

vailable Variables;	•	Selected Variables: weight waist	C Principal Components C Principal Components C Parital Image (No Iterations)
	+	chins situps	C Guttman Image C Harris Scaled Image
		1	C Alpha
			C Principal Factors
			Rotation Options: C Varimax C Oblimax C Quartimax C Manual (Graphical) C Procrustean C NO rotation
Output Options:			Min. root size to rotate: 1
Descriptive Statistics Correlation Matrix Unrotated Factors	Scree Pla Commun Plot Fact Factor So	ot Save Cor. Matrix alities Save Factor Matri ors Sort Factors core:	Maximum Iterations: 25

Figure 1. Factor Analysis Dialog

Note the options elected in the above form. The results obtained are shown below:



Figure 2. Scree Plot of Eigenvalues

```
Factor Analysis
See Rummel, R.J., Applied Factor Analysis
Northwestern University Press, 1970
Canonical Factor Analysis
Original matrix trace = 18.56
Roots (Eigenvalues) Extracted:
  1 15.512
   2 3.455
   3 0.405
   4 0.010
   5 -0.185
   6 -0.641
Unrotated Factor Loadings
FACTORS with
               20 valid cases.
Variables
            Factor 1
                     Factor 2
                               Factor 3 Factor 4
```

weight	0.858	-0.286	0.157	-0.006	0.000
waist	0.928	-0.201	-0.066	-0.003	0.000
pulse	-0.360	0.149	-0.044	-0.089	0.000
chins	-0.644	-0.382	0.195	0.009	0.000
situps	-0.770	-0.472	0.057	-0.009	0.000
jumps	-0.409	-0.689	-0.222	0.005	0.000

Factor 5

Varia	ables
-------	-------

	Factor 6
weight	0.000
waist	0.000
pulse	0.000

```
        chins
        0.000

        situps
        0.000

        jumps
        0.000

  situps
Percent of Trace In Each Root:
   1 Root := 15.512 Trace := 18.557 Percent := 83.593
   2 Root := 3.455 Trace := 18.557 Percent := 18.621
   3 Root := 0.405 Trace := 18.557 Percent := 2.180
   4 Root := 0.010 Trace := 18.557 Percent := 0.055
   5 Root := -0.185 Trace := 18.557 Percent := -0.995
   6 Root := -0.641 Trace := 18.557 Percent := -3.455
COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES
  1 weight 0.844
  2 waist
               0.906
  3 pulse
               0.162
                0.598
  4 chins
  5 situps
                0.819
                0.692
  6 jumps
Proportion of variance in unrotated factors
  1 48.364
  2 16.475
Communality Estimates as percentages:
  1 81.893
  2 90.153
  3 15.165
  4 56.003
  5 81.607
  6 64.217
Varimax Rotated Loadings with 20 valid cases.
Variables
              Factor 1 Factor 2
   weight
               -0.882
                             -0.201
                -0.898
                             -0.310
   waist
                 0.385
                               0.059
    pulse
    chins
                0.352
                               0.660
   situps
                0.413
                               0.803
             -0.009
                              0.801
     jumps
Percent of Variation in Rotated Factors
Factor 1 33.776
Factor 2 31.064
Total Percent of Variance in Factors : 64.840
Communalities as Percentages
               weight 81.893
  1 for
```

2	for	waist	90.153
3	for	pulse	15.165
4	for	chins	56.003
5	for	situps	81.607
6	for	jumps	64.217

SCATTERPLOT - FACTOR PLOT



- 2 = jumps
- 3 = chins
- 4 = pulse
- 5 = weight

6 = waist

SUBJECT FACTOR SCORE RESULTS:

Regression Coefficients with 20 valid cases.

Variables		
	Factor 1	Factor 2
weight	-0.418	0.150
waist	-0.608	0.080
pulse	0.042	-0.020
chins	-0.024	0.203
situps	-0.069	0.526
jumps	-0.163	0.399
Standard Error	of Factor	Scores:
Factor 1 0.	946	
Factor 2 0.	905	

We note that two factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and when rotated indicate that the three body measurements appear to load on one factor and that the performance measures load on the second factor. The data grid also now contains the "least-squares" factor scores for each subject. Hummm! I wonder what a hierarchical grouping of these subjects on the two factor scores would produce!