# **Multivariate: Principal components analysis**

## **Table of contents**



## **[8 Conclusion](#page-25-0) 26**



## <span id="page-1-0"></span>**1 Goals**

## <span id="page-1-1"></span>**1.1 Goals**

## **1.1.1 Goals of this lecture**

- Principal components analysis (PCA)
	- **– Dimension reduction**: reduce number of variables
- A **large set of (potentially correlated) observed variables**
	- **–** Organize the **variance** in those variables to a **smaller set** of orthogonal (uncorrelated) variables

## <span id="page-1-2"></span>**2 Statistical measurement**

## <span id="page-1-3"></span>**2.1 Statistical measurement**

#### **2.1.1 Measuring things is hard**

- Psychology: we **cannot directly measure** some constructs
	- **–** No ruler to measure "intelligence" or "introversion"
- We can **indirectly** measure what we really want to measure
	- **–** Want to measure **intelligence**
		- ∗ Math ability, verbal ability, spatial ability, reasoning, general knowledge, etc.
	- **–** Intelligence is a **latent variable**
		- ∗ Not *directly* observed

## **2.1.2 Two ways to think about latent variables**

- 1. Latent variable is a **result** of item responses
	- *Formative* latent variable
	- Principal components analysis (PCA)
	- This week
- 2. Latent variable **causes** item responses
	- *Reflective* latent variable
	- Factor analysis (FA)
	- Next week (and most of what you'll do)

## **2.1.3 Formative vs reflective latent variables**

• Formative factor



• Reflective factor



#### **2.1.4 Latent variables as dimension reduction**

- In each of these examples
	- **–** 3 observed variables and 1 latent variable
- But you can have **many more** observed variables
	- **–** As many measures of the latent variable as you have
- Often more than 1 latent variable
	- **–** Number of latent variables < number of observed variables
		- ∗ **Dimension reduction**

## <span id="page-3-0"></span>**3 Super quick review**

#### <span id="page-3-1"></span>**3.1 Eigenvectors and eigenvalues**

#### **3.1.1 Eigenvectors and eigenvalues**

- Eigenvectors / values are the solution to **homogenous equations**
	- $[**A** \lambda **I**]$  $\nu = 0$
	- $\lambda$  (lambda) is the eigenvalues,  $\nu$  (nu) is the eigenvectors
- **Maximize** a function while also imposing some **constraints**
	- **–** In the case of PCA
	- **– Maximize** the **variance** (1st eigenvalue is largest)
	- **– Constrain** eigenvectors to be **orthogonal**

#### **3.1.2 Eigenvectors**

- Eigenvectors are created from a matrix (such as  $\mathbf{R}_{XX}$ )
	- **–** Form basis or reference axes for that matrix
	- **–** All mutually *orthogonal*
- If matrix is full rank
	- **–** As many eigenvectors as variables (from a corr or cov matrix)
		- ∗ variables means eigenvalues and eigenvectors
		- ∗ 5 variables means 5 eigenvalues and eigenvectors

## **3.1.3 Eigenvalues**

- One eigenvalue for each eigenvector
	- **–** How much **variance** associated with that eigenvector
	- **–** First eigenvector has the highest eigenvalue, then decreases
- Sum of eigenvalues for a matrix  $=$  sum of diagonal elements
	- $-$  5  $\times$  5 correlation matrix  $\rightarrow$  eigenvalues add to 5

## <span id="page-4-0"></span>**4 Data Example**

## <span id="page-4-1"></span>**4.1 Measure and variables**

## **4.1.1 Simulated data**

- Data from last week's class
	- **–** 100 subjects
	- **–** 6 continuous variables
- Color-coded correlation matrix



## **4.1.2 Observed and latent variables**

- Observed variables
	- **–** 6 variables
	- **– These are all variables**: they predict the latent variable
- Latent variables
	- $-$  These are the  $Y$  variables
	- **–** They are the **components** (P**C**A)
	- **–** We *create* them in the analysis

## <span id="page-5-0"></span>**4.2 Output of the analysis**

## **4.2.1 Data reduction**

• The idea behind PCA is to reduce the number of variables

- **–** Start with **6 items**
	- ∗ Want **fewer** than 6 components
	- ∗ How many fewer?
- I simulated the data to have 2 "clumps"
	- **–** We talked about this last week
	- **–** So I'll show you a **2 component model** *to start*

#### **4.2.2 PCA results**

- 1. Loadings
	- Relation between observed variable  $(X)$  and component  $(Y)$ 
		- Matrix with rows  $=$   $\#$  items, columns  $=$   $\#$  components
		- $-$  High loading  $=$  that  $X$  is highly related to that  $Y$
	- Think: correlation or standardized regression coefficient
		- **–** Range from -1 to 1

### **4.2.3 Model results: Loadings in R**

Loadings:

PC1 PC2 x1 0.739 -0.425 x2 0.779 -0.468 x3 0.488 -0.623 x4 0.552 0.577 x5 0.546 0.714 x6 0.514 0.534

PC1 PC2 SS loadings 2.257 1.914 Proportion Var 0.376 0.319 Cumulative Var 0.376 0.695





**Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.** 

**4.2.4 Model results: Loadings in SPSS**

### **4.2.5 Loadings**



#### **4.2.6 Simple structure and rotation**

- Solution has **simple structure** if each item has **high loadings** on only one component and **near zero loadings** on all other components
	- **–** i.e., points are near the axes
	- **–** Easier to interpret: items only relate to one axis
- **Rotated solution** rotates the axes to get closer to *simple structure*
	- **–** We'll look at some different ways to rotate the solution
		- ∗ I'll show you a conceptual version now
	- **–** Easier to interpret a solution that has simple structure

## **4.2.7 Loadings on rotated axes**



### **4.2.8 PCA results**

- 2. Communalities
	- Remember that we don't retain all the components
	- Communalities are the proportion of variance in X that's reproduced by the com**ponents ( ) that you do retain**
	- Think:  $R_{multiple}^2$  for Ys predicting Xs
		- **–** This is weird, right? Yeah, I'll explain more

## **4.2.9 Model results: Communalities in R**

x1 x2 x3 x4 x5 x6 0.7261219 0.8252297 0.6261259 0.6372285 0.8070047 0.5491167

## **4.2.10 Model results: Communalities in SPSS**



## **4.2.11 PCA overview**

- **Loadings** tell us *how items are correlated with components*
	- **–** Simple structure makes loadings more interpretable
- **Communalities** tell us how much *variance* in the items is *explained* by *the components we kept*
- But where did the  $Y\mathrm{s}$  / components even come from?

## <span id="page-11-0"></span>**5 PCA details**

## <span id="page-11-1"></span>**5.1 PCA process**

## **5.1.1 Step 1: Correlation matrix**

• PCA starts by calculating the correlation matrix

$$
\mathbf{R}_{XX} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & r_{X_1X_2} & r_{X_1X_3} & r_{X_1X_4} & r_{X_1X_5} & r_{X_1X_6} \\ r_{X_2X_1} & 1 & r_{X_2X_3} & r_{X_2X_4} & r_{X_2X_5} & r_{X_2X_6} \\ r_{X_3X_1} & r_{X_3X_2} & 1 & r_{X_3X_4} & r_{X_3X_5} & r_{X_3X_6} \\ r_{X_4X_1} & r_{X_4X_2} & r_{X_4X_3} & 1 & r_{X_4X_5} & r_{X_4X_6} \\ r_{X_5X_1} & r_{X_5X_2} & r_{X_5X_3} & r_{X_5X_4} & 1 & r_{X_5X_6} \\ r_{X_6X_1} & r_{X_6X_2} & r_{X_6X_3} & r_{X_6X_4} & r_{X_6X_5} & 1 \end{bmatrix}
$$

## **5.1.2 Step 1: Correlation matrix**

• PCA starts by calculating the correlation matrix



## **5.1.3 Step 2: Eigenvalues and eigenvectors**

- **Eigenvalues** of correlation matrix
	- **–** We're not going to do anything with these right now
- [1] 2.2566146 1.9142128 0.7510163 0.4963613 0.3482518 0.2335431
	- **Eigenvectors** of correlation matrix:  $p \times r$  matrix
		- **–** Each **column** is an eigenvector / axis

 $[0,1]$   $[0,2]$   $[0,3]$   $[0,4]$   $[0,5]$   $[0,6]$ [1,] -0.4917076 0.3070964 0.2458906 0.54136266 -0.3027305 0.4676901 [2,] -0.5183409 0.3381863 0.1510558 0.05919316 0.3956537 -0.6588544 [3,] -0.3247308 0.4503119 -0.4335595 -0.64643283 -0.2133135 0.2010403 [4,] -0.3674707 -0.4167786 0.5131075 -0.44899215 0.3249147 0.3475890 [5,] -0.3632801 -0.5157586 -0.0382021 -0.05343548 -0.6660796 -0.3924843 [6,] -0.3421828 -0.3857845 -0.6811809 0.28477700 0.3963310 0.1785989

#### **5.1.4 Step 3: Create latent variables**

- The matrix of eigenvectors is **A**
	- **–** If matrix not full rank, fewer columns

 ${\bf A} =$  $\begin{vmatrix} 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 13 & 10 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & a_{24} & a_{25} & a_{26} \end{vmatrix}$  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\vert$  $\vert$  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\vert$  $\begin{bmatrix} a_{61} & a_{62} & a_{63} & a_{64} & a_{65} & a_{66} \end{bmatrix}$  $\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} & a_{14} & a_{15} & a_{16} \end{bmatrix}$  $a_{31}$   $a_{32}$   $a_{33}$   $a_{34}$   $a_{35}$   $a_{36}$  $a_{41}$   $a_{42}$   $a_{43}$   $a_{44}$   $a_{45}$   $a_{46}$  $a_{51}$   $a_{52}$   $a_{53}$   $a_{54}$   $a_{55}$   $a_{56}$  $\overline{a}$  $\overline{a}$  $\overline{a}$  $\overline{a}$  $\overline{a}$ 

#### **5.1.5 Step 3: Create latent variables**

$$
\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A}
$$

$$
(n,r) = (n,p)(p,r)
$$

• In this example

 $-100$  subjects ( $n = 100$ )

- Correlation matrix is full rank so  $p = r = 6$
- **Y** has 100 rows and 6 columns

#### **5.1.6 Step 3: Create latent variables**

**Y**  $\sum_{(n,\,r)}^{n} = \frac{1}{(n,\,p)(p,\,r)}$ **X A**

- Each person now has
	- 6 X values (specific to each person)
	- **–** 6 values (specific to each person)
	- **–** Same values of **A**: these are **weights** (like in linear regression, same weights for everyone)

#### **5.1.7 Step 3: Create latent variables**

- $Y$  variables are **linear combinations** of  $X$ s and **A** 
	- Each  $Y$  is an  $n \times 1$  vector
- First Y variable:  $\underline{Y}_1 = a_{11}\underline{X}_1 + a_{21}\underline{X}_2 + a_{31}\underline{X}_3 + a_{41}\underline{X}_4 + a_{51}\underline{X}_5 + a_{61}\underline{X}_6$
- Second Y variable:  $\underline{Y}_2 = a_{12}\underline{X}_1 + a_{22}\underline{X}_2 + a_{32}\underline{X}_3 + a_{42}\underline{X}_4 + a_{52}\underline{X}_5 + a_{62}\underline{X}_6$
- Looks like a regression, but note that it's not  $\hat{Y}$  and there's no +e

## **5.1.8 Step 4: Use orthogonal**  $Y$ s to predict original  $X$ s

 $\frac{\mathbf{X}}{(n,p)} = \frac{\mathbf{Y}}{(n,y)}$  $(n, r)$ **B**  $(r, p)$ 

- *Ys* are **orthogonal** 
	- $-$  Now use them as (uncorrelated) predictors to predict Xs
- **B** is the (unrotated) matrix of loadings
	- **–** Rows = components, columns = items

## **5.1.9 Step 4: Use orthogonal Ys to predict original Xs**

$$
\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Y} \quad \mathbf{B}
$$
\n
$$
(n, p) = (n, r)(r, p)
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix}\n b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} & b_{14} & b_{15} & b_{16} \\
 b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} & b_{24} & b_{25} & b_{26} \\
 b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} & b_{34} & b_{35} & b_{36} \\
 b_{41} & b_{42} & b_{43} & b_{44} & b_{45} & b_{46} \\
 b_{51} & b_{52} & b_{53} & b_{54} & b_{55} & b_{56} \\
 b_{61} & b_{62} & b_{63} & b_{64} & b_{65} & b_{66}\n\end{bmatrix}
$$

#### **5.1.10 Four things about the loadings matrix**

- In practice, it will have **fewer rows**
	- **–** We don't retain all the components (e.g., 2 in this example)
- Unlike a lot of matrices we look at
	- **–** All elements are unique  $(b_{21} \neq b_{12})$
- In software, the **transpose** of this matrix is given
	- **–** Rows = items, columns = components
- Think of them like **standardized regression coefficients**
	- $-$  But since Y are orthogonal, they're **not partial coefficients**

#### **5.1.11 One thing about communalities**

- Communalities are the proportion of variance in X that's reproduced by the compo**nents ( ) that you do retain**
	- $-$  Think:  $R_{multiple}^2$  for Ys predicting Xs
	- $-$  But why Y predicting  $X$ ? That's backward!
- We don't do a perfect job re-creating the information from  $p$  variables using fewer than  $p$  components
	- $-$  How much variance in Xs did we **retain** with the Ys that we **retained**?

## <span id="page-14-0"></span>**6 How many components?**

#### <span id="page-14-1"></span>**6.1 How many components?**

#### **6.1.1 How many components?**

- The main objective of PCA is to **reduce the number of variables**
	- $-$  Have  $p X$  variables
	- $-$  Want to be able to describe them with **fewer** than  $p Y$  variables
- There are several methods to choose
	- **–** Often give different results

## <span id="page-15-0"></span>**6.2 Scree plot**

## **6.2.1 Scree plot**



## **6.2.2 Scree plot**

- First component accounts for the most variance
	- **–** Second component accounts for less, third for even less, etc.
- At what point does adding more components not help account for more variance?
	- **–** Look for "drop" in the scree plot
	- **–** Somewhat arbitrary, can be difficult to determine

## <span id="page-16-0"></span>**6.3 Kaiser criteria**

## **6.3.1 Kaiser criteria: Don't use this**

- Also called "eigenvalues greater than 1" criteria
	- **–** With PCA, you're dealing with the **correlation matrix**
	- **–** Diagonals are all 1s
	- **–** If each component accounts for "its share" of the variance
		- ∗ Then all eigenvalues are 1
		- ∗ Components with eigenvalue > 1 are doing better than that
- Tends to over-extract (too many components)

## **6.3.2 Kaiser criteria**



## <span id="page-17-0"></span>**6.4 Proportion of variance**

### **6.4.1 Proportion of variance accounted for**

- Kepp any component that accounts for more than a certain percentage of variance
	- **–** Must choose some arbitrary percentage
	- **–** Not commonly used in psychology
		- ∗ More commonly used in engineering

## <span id="page-17-1"></span>**6.5 Parallel analysis**

## **6.5.1 Parallel analysis**

- Simulation based method
- Generate **random correlation matrices** with same  $p$  and  $n$  as data
	- **–** Two ways: new simulated data or re-sample from your data
	- **–** Estimate the eigenvalues from these random correlation matrices
	- **–** Retain components with eigenvalues higher than (default) 95%ile of the random values



## **Parallel Analysis Scree Plots**



#### **6.5.3 Parallel analysis in SPSS**

- Requires some external scripts with lots of those MATRIX statements
	- **–** [Brian O'Connor's website](https://oconnor-psych.ok.ubc.ca/nfactors/nfactors.html)
	- **–** [Youtube video explaining](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRsiMQ1CLfI)
	- **–** Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational research methods, 7(2)*, 191-205.

Run MATRIX procedure:

PARALLEL ANALYSIS:

Principal Components

Specifications for this Run: **Ncases** 100 **Nvars** 6 Ndatsets 1000  $95$ Percent



------ END MATRIX -----



**Extraction Method, Principal Component Analysis.** 

## **6.5.4 Parallel analysis in SPSS**

## <span id="page-20-0"></span>**6.6 MAP**

## **6.6.1 Minimum average partials (MAP)**

- Look at "partialed" correlation matrix after each component
	- **–** First component accounts for the most variance
		- ∗ After the first component is partialled out, correlations between variables should be smaller
	- **–** Second component account for the next most variance
		- ∗ After the second component is partialled out, correlations between variables should be smaller, etc
	- **–** You have **enough components** when average partial correlation is **minimized**

### **6.6.2 MAP test in R**



Number of factors

#### Number of factors

Call:  $vss(x = x, n = n, rotate = rotate, diagonal = diagonal, fm = fm,$ n.obs = n.obs, plot = FALSE, title = title, use = use, cor = cor) VSS complexity 1 achieves a maximimum of 0.6 with 3 factors VSS complexity 2 achieves a maximimum of 0.87 with 5 factors The Velicer MAP achieves a minimum of 0.12 with 2 factors Empirical BIC achieves a minimum of  $-14.87$  with 2 factors Sample Size adjusted BIC achieves a minimum of 1.77 with 2 factors

#### Statistics by number of factors



```
1 1.6e+02 2.3e-01 0.300 121
2 3.6e+00 3.4e-02 0.067 -15
3 1.8e-01 7.8e-03 NA NA
4 1.0e-09 5.8e-07 NA NA
5 5.4e-16 4.2e-10 NA NA
6 5.4e-16 4.2e-10 NA NA
```
## **6.6.3 MAP test in SPSS**

- See resources for parallel analysis
	- **–** Those include Velicer's MAP test

## <span id="page-22-0"></span>**6.7 Solution makes sense**

### **6.7.1 Solution makes sense (theoretically)**

- Do the components make sense?
	- **–** Does it make sense for the items that load highly on each component to belong together?
- Don't use this as your only criterion
	- **–** This is what makes this science
	- **–** Not just a computer spitting out numbers

## <span id="page-22-1"></span>**6.8 Summary of number of components**

#### **6.8.1 Summary of choosing number of components**

- Several methods available
	- **–** Best case: They'll all agree
	- **–** More likely: They will not
- When in doubt, go with parallel analysis or MAP
	- **–** Scree plot and Kaiser don't work well
- Also consider rotated solutions (next)

## <span id="page-23-0"></span>**7 Rotation**

## <span id="page-23-1"></span>**7.1 Simple structure**

## **7.1.1 Simple structure and rotation**

- Solution has **simple structure** if each item has **high loadings** on only one component and **near zero loadings** on all other components
	- **–** i.e., points are near the axes
	- **–** Easier to interpret: items only relate to one axis
- **Rotated solution** rotates the axes to get closer to *simple structure*
	- **–** We'll look at some different ways to rotate the solution
		- ∗ I'll show you one way right now
	- **–** Easier to interpret a solution that has simple structure

## **7.1.2 Loadings on unrotated vs rotated axes**

• Loadings on unrotated axes



• Loadings on rotated axes



## <span id="page-24-0"></span>**7.2 Orthogonal and oblique rotation**

## **7.2.1 Orthogonal rotation**

- **Orthogonal** means uncorrelated
	- **–** Geometrically, axes are **perpendicular** (right angles)
- Components are all mutually orthogonal to start
	- **–** Because the eigenvectors are mutually orthogonal
- Orthogonal rotation **rotates** the axes but keeps them uncorrelated

## **7.2.2 Orthogonal rotations**

- **Varimax**
	- **– Max**imizes the **var**iance of squared loadings
- **–** High variance means loadings are bimodal
- **–** Bimodal: loadings near 0 or 1 (simple structure)

## **7.2.3 Oblique rotation**

- **Oblique** means correlated
	- **–** Geometrically, axes are **NOT perpendicular**
- Oblique rotation **rotates** the axes and **also** changes the angle between them
	- **–** Components are **correlated**
	- **–** Additional output: correlations between components

## **7.2.4 Oblique rotations**

- **Oblimin**
	- **–** Minimize correlation between components while trying to eliminate "in between" loadings  $(0.1 \text{ to } 0.3)$

### • **Promax**

- **–** Work toward a *target loading matrix*
- **–** Target matrix is loading matrix raised to a *power*
- **–** Move axes toward to get closer to target matrix
- **–** Can be difficult to use well: which power to raise to?

## <span id="page-25-0"></span>**8 Conclusion**

## <span id="page-25-1"></span>**8.1 Summary of this week**

## **8.1.1 Summary of this week**

- Principal components analysis (PCA)
	- $-$  Reduce  $\#$  of variables (from  $p$  variables to  $\lt p$  components)
	- **–** Loadings relate items to components
	- **–** Communalities are how much variance in each item is retained with that number components
	- **–** Rotation to improve interpretability, correlate components

## <span id="page-26-0"></span>**8.2 Next week**

## **8.2.1 Next week**

- $\bullet~$  Factor analysis
	- **–** Related to PCA, but quite different model
	- **–** Different set of assumptions: Aligns with psychology