

CCSM Preliminary Analyses

by
 Scott Roesch
 Professor in the Department of Psychology
 San Diego State University

Analytic Steps:

1. Evaluation of missing data and functional sample size
2. Presentation by scale of reliability and factor analysis
3. Descriptive statistics for scales
4. Correlations among scales

1. Evaluation of missing data and functional sample size

- Total N = 737
- 126 participants missing data on all scales, functional N = 611
- Listwise N = 399
- Smaller amounts of missing data by scale, I used all available data, so N ranges 483-610 depending on scale

2. Presentation by scale of reliability and factor analysis

Scale	Reliability (α) ^a	Factor Analysis ^b	Notes
SOC	.72	All loadings strong (range from .53-.74) except for SOC_SPORTS (.31)	SOC_SPORTS not great, correlations < .3 with other items
FACULTY	.92	All loadings strong (range from .62-.86)	
STUDENT	.94	All loadings strong (range from .75-.87)	
ACTIONCONTROL	.89	All loadings strong (range from .68-.91)	
EFFICACY	.85	All loadings strong (range from .60-.90)	
RACIALGENDER	.92	All loadings strong (range from .86-.91)	
UTILITY	.83	All loadings strong (range from .51-.91)	
SOB	.90	All loadings strong (range from .80-.87)	
RACEAFFIN	.91	All loadings strong (range from .78-.90)	
SRV	.72	All loadings strong (range from .46-.70)	
CARE	.90	All loadings strong (range from .61-.91)	
BREADWINNER	.55	First two items have strong loadings (.67,.70), third item is weak (.35)	3 rd item has correlations < .25 with other two
COMPETITION	.63	All loadings strong (range from .56-.67) except for item 3 (.33)	3 rd item has correlations < .27 with other two
HELP	.59	All loadings strong (range from .49-.72)	Not bad, just small number of items
FEMINIE	.81	All loadings strong (range from .60-.82)	

^avalues > .7 are considered acceptable; values > .6 are reason for scales with 4 or fewer items

^bgenerally want loadings > .45

3. Descriptive statistics for scales (scale items were summed to create the scales)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
soc	610	1.00	28.00	9.5803	4.84752
faculty	524	3.00	42.00	33.2901	6.98372
student	518	1.00	42.00	30.4440	7.66714
action_control	588	7.00	24.00	19.9031	3.63905
efficacy	588	10.00	24.00	20.8776	2.84859
racial_gender	588	2.00	18.00	6.2602	3.77231
utility	581	4.00	24.00	20.6196	3.20531
sob	581	4.00	24.00	16.4182	4.99748
race_affin	581	4.00	24.00	17.3838	5.68079
srv	573	4.00	36.00	12.8464	5.31565
care	483	4.00	36.00	25.5487	7.66785
breadwinner	574	3.00	18.00	13.6080	3.14035
competition	573	4.00	24.00	18.0000	3.97325
help	575	4.00	18.00	14.9530	2.69847
feminine	575	10.00	24.00	22.2626	2.49506
Valid N (listwise)	399				

Notes on Normality: There is some negative skew FACULTY, UTILITY, CARE, and FEMININE; and some positive skew for SOC and RACIALGENDER. FEMININE is the one of greatest concern. The scores really pile up on the high end of the scale. In general, however, I am not overly-concerned.

4. Correlations among scales

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. SOC														
2. FACULTY	.15*													
3. STUDENT	.25*	.48*												
4. ACTIONCONTROL	.15*	.16*	.28*											
5. EFFICACY	.04	.19*	.16*	.29*										
6. RACIALGENDER	.12*	-.25*	-.06	-.07	-.02									
7. UTILITY	.19*	.22*	.24*	.53*	.32*	-.05								
8. SOB	.37*	.37	.37*	.41*	.18*	-.11*	.46*							
9. RACEAFFIN	.20*	.05	.13*	.23*	.02	.13*	.22*	.38*						
10. SRV	.50*	.13*	.13*	.23*	.00	.16*	.20*	.32*	.19*					
11. CARE	.19*	.17*	.17*	.07	.10*	-.11*	.18*	.36*	.12*	.22*				
12. BREADWINNER	.11*	.14	.19*	.12*	.01	-.05	.24*	.18*	.08	.14*	.16*			
13. COMPETITION	-.07	.04	.11*	.05	.03	-.10*	.09*	.02	.03	-.09*	.07	.34*		
14. HELP	.08	.22*	.23*	.29*	.23*	-.14*	.20*	.20*	.05	.06	.08	.18*	.29*	
15. FEMINIE	.06	.19*	.11*	.25*	.18*	-.20*	.42*	.28*	.08	.04	.19*	.25*	.19*	.39*

*p<.05