1. Single out all QC questions, and “So what I've been done with the CCS revision project data is that people who didn't get all QC questions right were dropped, but if they missed 1 or 2 of the QC questions and got all the other QC questions right, they are kept in the dataset. There are 9 of them, and 8 of them missed just 1, while the other one missed.”
2. The original sample size is 1312, and the N dropped to 1159 after leaving out people who didn’t pass the QC questions and who missed almost all questions.
3. Then an EFA was performed using the dataset with a PC extraction and varimax and direct oblimin rotation. Note that the limit of iteration needs to be set a bit large, because sometimes it’s easy for SPSS to exceed the default number of iterations (25). The EFA supports a 10-factor model, and then, a principal axis factoring extraction was used with direct oblimin rotation, because factors are correlated.
4. The results of #3 were that responsibility facet was terrible with items loading messily, and formality items loading mostly on orderliness. All other facets were recognized. Although, there were 2 facets that were kind of hard to name, which are (according to content of the items loading on them) “leading a casual lifestyle”, and “high C people and behavior are just dumb”.
5. Being reported with such results, Brent suggested that I 1. leave out positively worded lowC items (which loaded mostly on the 2 weird facets); 2. leave out formality items (because they are both uninteresting and loading on orderliness), and 3. Use half of the punctuality items (because we don’t need that many).

**Brent’s original instructions are as below:**

**The first thing to do is to vary the number of factors extracted--a few lower than 10 and a few higher than 10 (8 through 12) -- to see what happens to the structure. We use this information to glean how robust the structure is.**

**In terms of dropping content, I would say first, let's drop the items that we created that would be considered positive to low C people.  These mostly ended up on the "casual lifestyle" factor so are clearly not marking the same domains as they were intended.**

**I'd also like to run the EFA without the formality items as these are both uninteresting and co-loading on the orderliness factor which doesn't need any help.**

**Also, we could probably re-run things with half of the punctuality items as we clearly won't need that many to create a reliable dimension.  I would do each of these separately at first to see how each change hurts or helps.**

1. I ran the analysis based on the instructions in #5, but the structure didn’t improve much.
2. Then Brent proposed another tack, which is doing an EFA with oblique rotation by facet. These analyses (9 EFAs because of 9 facets) have showed that all facets have more than 1 factor (# of factors ranging from 5-6). Looking at the content of the items falling under different factors, the differences are pretty clear. I’m not sure what this means, but I guess it means although belonging to the same facet, different items can still form clusters reflecting different aspects of the facet. Need to summarize the differences and send to Brent.