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## Overview

1. Purpose of correlation
$\qquad$
2. Covariation
3. Linear correlation
4. Types of correlation
5. Interpreting correlation
6. Assumptions / limitations
7. Dealing with several correlations

## Readings

## Howell (2010)

- Ch6 Categorical Data \& Chi-Square
- Ch9 Correlation \& Regression
- Ch10 Alternative Correlational Techniques
- 10.1 Point-Biserial Correlation and Phi: Pearson Correlation by Another Name
- 10.3 Correlation Coefficients for Ranked Data


## Purpose of correlation

## Purpose of correlation

The underlying purpose of correlation is to help address the question:
What is the

- relationship or
- degree of association or
- amount of shared variance between two variables?


## Purpose of correlation

Other ways of expressing the underlying correlational question include:
To what extent

- do two variables covary?
- are two variables dependent or independent of one another?
- can one variable be predicted from another?

Covariation
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## The world is made of covariation.
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Covariations are the basis of more complex models.
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Linear correlation
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## Linear correlation

The extent to which two variables have a simple linear (straight-line) relationship.
Linear correlations provide the building blocks for multivariate correlational analyses, such as:

- Factor analysis
- Reliability
- Multiple linear regression


## Linear correlation

Linear relations between variables are indicated by correlations:

- Direction: Correlation sign (+ /-) indicates direction of linear relationship
- Strength: Correlation size indicates strength (ranges from -1 to +1 )
- Statistical significance: $p$ indicates likelihood that observed relationship could have occurred by chance


## What is the linear correlation?

## Types of answers

- No relationship (independence)
- Linear relationship:
-As one variable $\uparrow$ s, so does the other (+ve)
-As one variable $\uparrow \mathrm{s}$, the other $\downarrow \mathrm{s}$ (-ve)
- Non-linear relationship
- Pay caution due to:
- Heteroscedasticity
-Restricted range
-Heterogeneous samples
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## Types of correlation

To decide which type of correlation to use, consider the levels of measurement for each variable

## Types of correlation

- Nominal by nominal: Phi (Ф) / Cramer's V, Chi-squared
- Ordinal by ordinal:

Spearman's rank / Kendall's Tau b

- Dichotomous by interval/ratio:

Point bi-serial $r_{p b}$

- Interval/ratio by interval/ratio:

Product-moment or Pearson's $r$

## Types of correlation and LOM

|  | Nominal | Ordinal | Int/Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal | Clustered barchart, Chi-square, Phi ( $\varphi$ ) or Cramer's V | $\Longleftarrow$ Recode | Scatterplot, bar chart or error-bar chart Point bi-serial correlation $\left(r_{p b}\right)$ |
| Ordinal |  | Scatterplot or clustered bar chart <br> Spearman's Rho or Kendall's Tau | $\Longleftarrow \Uparrow_{\text {Recode }}$ |
| Int/Ratio |  |  | Scatterplot <br> Product- <br> moment <br> correlation (18 |

## Nominal by nominal

## Nominal by nominal correlational approaches

- Contingency (or cross-tab) tables
- Observed
- Expected
- Row and/or column \%s
- Marginal totals
- Clustered bar chart
- Chi-square
- Phi/Cramer's V


## Contingency tables

- Bivariate frequency tables
- Cell frequencies (red)
- Marginal totals (blue)



## Contingency table: Example

## b2 Do you snore? * b3r Sm oker Crosstabulation

Count

|  |  | b3r Smoker |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | 0 No | 1 Yes | Total |
| b2 Do you | 0 yes | 50 | 16 | $\left(\begin{array}{r}66 \\ \text { snore? }\end{array}\right.$ |
| 1 no | 111 | 9 | 120 |  |
| Total |  | 161 | 25 | 186 |

RED = Contingency cells BLUE $=$ Marginal totals

## Contingency table: Example

## b2 Do you snore? * b3r Smoker Crosstabulation

|  |  |  | b3r Smoker |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | 0 | No | 1 Yes | Total |
| b2 Do you | 0 | yes | Count | 50 | 16 |
| snore? |  | Expected Count | 57.1 | 8.9 | 66.0 |
|  | 1 no | Count | 111 | 9 | 120 |
|  |  | Expected Count | 103.9 | 16.1 | 120.0 |
| Total |  | Count | 161 | 25 | 186 |
|  |  | Expected Count | 161.0 | 25.0 | 186.0 |

Chi-square is based on the differences between the actual and expected cell counts.

## b2 Do you snore? * b3r Smoker Crosstabulation

\% within b2 Do you snore?

|  |  | b3r Smoker |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  |  | 0 No | 1 Yes | Total |
| b2 Do you | 0 yes | $75.8 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| snore? | 1 no | $92.5 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total |  | $86.6 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Row and/or column cell percentages may also aid interpretation e.g., $\sim /$ /3rds of smokers snore, whereas only $\sim 1 / 3^{a}$ of non-smokers snore.


## Clustered bar graph

Bivariate bar graph of frequencies or percentages.


The category axis bars are clustered (by colour or fill pattern) to indicate the the second variable's categories.
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## Pearson chi-square test

The value of the test-statistic is

$$
X^{2}=\sum \frac{(O-E)^{2}}{E}
$$

where
$X^{2}=$ the test statistic that approaches a $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ distribution.
$O=$ frequencies observed
$E=$ frequencies expected (asserted by the null hypothesis).
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## Pearson chi-square test: Example

|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. <br> (2-sided) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 10.259 | 1 | .001 |
| Continuity Correction ${ }^{\circ}$ | 8.870 | 1 | .003 |
| Likelih ood Ratio | 9.780 | 1 | .002 |
| Fisher's Exact Test |  | 1 |  |
| Linear-by-Linear | 10.204 | 1 | .001 |
| Association | 186 |  |  |
| N of Valid Cases |  |  |  |

Write-up: $\chi 2(1,186)=10.26, p=.001$

## Chi-square distribution: Example

The Chi-Square Diştribution


$P(X \leq x)=\int_{0}^{x} \frac{1}{\Gamma(r / 2) 2^{r / 2}} w^{r / 2-1} e^{-w / 2} d w$

|  | 0.010 | 0.025 | 0.050 | $P(X \leq x)$. |  | 0.950 | 0.975 | 0.990 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 0.100 | 0.900 |  |  |  |
| $r$ | $\chi^{0} .9 .98(r)$ | $\chi^{2} .975(r)$ | $\chi_{0}^{2} .9 s(r)$ | $\chi_{0}^{2} .00(r)$ | $\chi_{0.10}^{2}(r)$ | $\chi_{0.0 s}^{2}$ (r) | $\chi_{0.025}^{2}(r)$ | $\chi_{0.01}^{2}(r)$ |
| 1 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.016 | 2.706 | (3.84D | 5.024 | 6.635 |
| 2 | 0.020 | 0.051 | 0.103 | 0.211 | 4.605 | 5.991 | 7.378 | 9.210 |
| 3 | 0.115 | 0.216 | 0.352 | 0.584 | 6.251 | 7.815 | 9.348 | 11.34 |
| 4 | 0.297 | 0.484 | 0.711 | 1.064 | 7.779 | 9.488 | 11.14 | 13.28 |
| 5 | 0.554 | 0.831 | 1.145 | 1.610 | 9.236 | 11.07 | 12.83 | 15.09 |

Phi (\$) \& Cramer's V
(non-parametric measures of correlation)

## Phi ( $\phi$ )

- Use for $2 \times 2,2 \times 3,3 \times 2$ analyses e.g., Gender (2) \& Pass/Fail (2)


## Cramer's V

- Use for $3 \times 3$ or greater analyses e.g., Favourite Season (4) x Favourite Sense (5)

Phi ( $\phi$ ) \& Cramer's V: Example

| Symm etric Measures |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Value | Approx. Sig |
| Nominal by | Phi | $.235)$ | $.001)$ |
| Nominal | Cramer's V | .235 | .001 |
| N of Valid Cases |  | 186 |  |

$\chi^{2}(1,186)=10.26, p=.001, \varphi=.24$

## Ordinal by ordinal

## Ordinal by ordinal

 correlational approaches- Spearman's rho $\left(r_{s}\right)$
- Kendall tau ( $\tau$ )
- Alternatively, use nominal by nominal techniques (i.e., treat as lower level of measurement)
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Graphing ordinal by ordinal data

- Ordinal by ordinal data is difficult to visualise because its non-parametric, yet there may be many points.
- Consider using:
-Non-parametric approaches (e.g., clustered bar chart)
-Parametric approaches (e.g., scatterplot with binning)


## Spearman's rho ( $r_{\mathrm{s}}$ ) or

## Spearman's rank order correlation

- For ranked (ordinal) data
-e.g. Olympic Placing correlated with World Ranking
- Uses product-moment correlation formula
- Interpretation is adjusted to consider the underlying ranked scales


## Kendall's Tau ( $\tau$ )

- Tau a
-Does not take joint ranks into account
- Tau b
- Takes joint ranks into account
-For square tables
- Tau c
-Takes joint ranks into account
-For rectangular tables
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## Dichotomous by

 interval/ratio$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Point-biserial correlation ( $r_{\mathrm{pb}}$ )

- One dichotomous \& one continuous variable
-e.g., belief in god (yes/no) and amount of international travel
- Calculate as for Pearson's product-moment $r$,
- Adjust interpretation to consider the underlying scales
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Point-biserial correlation ( $r_{p \mathrm{p}}$ ):

## Example

Correlations

| Correlations |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| b4r God | P4r Goarson Correlation | b8 Countries |  |
| $0=$ No | Sig. (2-tailed) | 1 | -.095 |
| $1=$ Yes | N | 127 | .288 |
| b8 Countries | Pearson Correlation | -.095 | 127 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .288 | 1 |
|  | N | 127 | 190 |

Interval/ratio by Interval/ratio
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## Scatterplot

- Plot each pair of observations (X, Y)
$-x=$ predictor variable (independent)
$-\mathrm{y}=$ criterion variable (dependent)
- By convention:
- the IV should be plotted on the $x$ (horizontal) axis
-the DV on the $y$ (vertical) axis.
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Scatterplot showing relationship between age \& cholesterol with line of best fit
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## Line of best fit

- The correlation between 2 variables is a measure of the degree to which pairs of numbers (points) cluster together around a best-fitting straight line
- Line of best fit: $y=a+b x$
- Check for:
-outliers
-linearity

What's wrong with this scatterplot? CORRELATION BETWEEN DRINKING AND SPELLING ERRORS
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Scatterplot example:
Weak positive (.14)


Scatterplot example:
Moderately strong negative (-.76)


## Pearson product-moment correlation (r)

- The product-moment correlation is the standardised covariance.

$$
r_{X, Y}=\frac{\operatorname{cov}(X, Y)}{S_{X} S_{Y}}
$$

## Covariance

- Variance shared by 2 variables
$\operatorname{Cov}_{X Y}=\frac{\Sigma(X-\bar{X})(Y-\bar{Y})}{N-1} \quad$ Cross products
- Covariance reflects the direction of the relationship:
+ve cov indicates + relationship -ve cov indicates - relationship.

Covariance: Cross-products


## Covariance

- Dependent on the scale of measurement $\rightarrow$ Can't compare covariance across different scales of measurement (e.g., age by weight in kilos versus age by weight in grams).
- Therefore, standardise covariance (divide by the cross-product of the Sds) $\rightarrow$ correlation
- Correlation is an effect size - i.e., standardised measure of strength of linear relationship


## Covariance, SD, and correlation: Quiz

For a given set of data the covariance between $X$ and $Y$ is 1.20. The $S D$ of $X$ is 2 and the $S D$ of $Y$ is 3 . The resulting correlation is:
a. . 20
b. .30
c. .40
d. 1.20

## Hypothesis testing

Almost all correlations are not 0 , therefore the question is:
"What is the likelihood that a relationship between variables is a 'true' relationship - or could it simply be a result of random sampling variability or 'chance'?"

## Significance of correlation

- Null hypothesis $\left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{0}}\right)$ : $\rho=0$ : assumes that there is no 'true' relationship (in the population)
- Alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right): \rho<>0$ : assumes that the relationship is real (in the population)
- Initially assume $\mathbf{H}_{0}$ is true, and evaluate whether the data support $\mathbf{H}_{1}$.
- $\rho($ rho $)=$ population product-moment correlation coefficient


## How to test the null hypothesis

- Select a critical value (alpha ( $\alpha$ )); commonly 05
- Can use a 1 or 2-tailed test
- Calculate correlation and its $p$ value. Compare this to the critical value.
- If $p<$ critical value, the correlation is statistically significant, i.e., that there is less than a $x \%$ chance that the relationship being tested is due to random sampling variability.


## Correlation - SPSS output



## Imprecision in hypothesis testing

- Type I error: rejects $\mathbf{H}_{0}$ when it is true
- Type II error: Accepts $\mathbf{H}_{0}$ when it is false
- Significance test result will depend on the power of study, which is a function of:
-Effect size (r)
-Sample size ( $N$ )
-Critical alpha level ( $\alpha_{\text {crit }}$ )


## Significance of correlation

| $d f$ | critical |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{(N-2)}{}$ | $\frac{p=.05}{}$ |  |
| 5 | .67 | The size of |
| 10 | .50 | correlation |
| 15 | .41 | required to be |
| 20 | .36 | significant |
| 25 | .32 | decreases as $N$ |
| 30 | .30 | increases - |
| 50 | .23 |  |
| 200 | .11 | why? |
| 500 | .07 |  |

Scatterplot showing a confidence interval for a line of best fit



## Practice quiz question:

## Significance of correlation

If the correlation between Age and test Performance is statistically significant, it means that:
a. there is an important relationship between Age and test Performance
b. the true correlation between Age and Performance in the population is equal to 0
c. the true correlation between Age and Performance in the population is not equal to 0
d. getting older causes you to do poorly on tests

Interpreting correlation

## Coefficient of Determination ( $r^{2}$ )

$\qquad$

- CoD = The proportion of variance or change in one variable that can be accounted for by another variable.
- e.g., $r=.60, r^{2}=.36$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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## Interpreting correlation (Cohen, 1988)

A correlation is an effect size, so guidelines re strength can be suggested.

```
Strength r
weak: . }1\mathrm{ to . 3 (1 to 10%)
moderate: . }3\mathrm{ to . 5 (10 to 25%)
strong: >.5 (> 25%)
```

Size of correlation (conen, 1988) WEAK (.1-.3)

MODERATE (.3-.5)

STRONG (>.5)

## Interpreting correlation

(Evans, 1996)

| Strength | $\underline{r}$ | $\underline{\sim}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| very weak | 0-. 19 | (0 to 4\%) |
| weak | . $20-.39$ | (4 to 16\%) |
| moderate | . 40 - . 59 | (16 to 36\%) |
| strong | . $60-.79$ | (36\% to 64\%) |
| very strong | . $80-1.00$ | (64\% to 100\%) |
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Correlation of this scatterplot $=-.9$


X1

Correlation of this scatterplot $=-.9$

X1

What do you estimate the correlation of this scatterplot of height and weight to be?
a. -.5
b. -1
c. 0
d. . 5
e. 1

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

What do you estimate the correlation of this scatterplot to be?
a. -.5
b. -1
c. 0
d. . 5
e. 1


What do you estimate the correlation of this scatterplot to be?
a. -.5
b. -1
c. 0
d. . 5
e. 1


Write-up: Example
"Number of children and marital satisfaction were inversely related ( $r(48)=-.35, p<.05$ ), such that contentment in marriage tended to be lower for couples with more children. Number of children explained approximately $10 \%$ of the variance in marital satisfaction, a small-moderate effect (see Figure 1)."

Assumptions and limitations
(Pearson product-moment linear correlation)
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## Assumptions and limitations

1. Levels of measurement $\geq$ interval
2. Correlation is not causation
3. Linearity
4. Effects of outliers
5. Non-linearity
6. Normality
7. Homoscedasticity
8. Range restriction
9. Heterogenous samples 75

Correlation is not causation e.g.,:
correlation between ice cream consumption and crime, but actual cause is temperature
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Correlation is not causation e.g.,: Stop global warming: Become a pirate


Causation may be in the eye of the beholder
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## Effect of outliers

- Outliers can disproportionately increase or decrease $r$.
- Options
-compute $r$ with \& without outliers
- get more data for outlying values
- recode outliers as having more conservative scores
-transformation
-recode variable into lower level of measurement

Age \& self-esteem

$$
(r=.63)
$$



AGE

Age \& self-esteem (outliers removed) $r=.23$


AGE
81

Non-linear relationships
Check scatterplot
Can a linear relationship 'capture' the lion's share of the variance?
If so, use $r$.


## Non-linear relationships

If non-linear, consider

- Does a linear relation help?
- Transforming variables to 'create' linear relationship
- Use a non-linear mathematical function to describe the relationship between the variables


## Normality

- The $X$ and $Y$ data should be sampled from populations with normal distributions
- Do not overly rely on a single indicator of normality; use histograms, skewness and kurtosis, and inferential tests (e.g., Shapiro-Wilks)
- Note that inferential tests of normality are overly sensitive when sample is large


## Homoscedasticity

- Homoscedasticity refers to even spread about a line of best fit
- Heteroscedasticity refers to uneven spread about a line of best fit
- Assess visually and with Levene's test

Homoscedasticity


Homoscedasticity with both variables normally distributed


Heteroscedasticity with skewness on one variable

## Range restriction

- Range restriction is when the sample contains restricted (or truncated) range of scores
-e.g., cognitive capacity and age $<18$ might have linear relationship
- If range restriction, be cautious in generalising beyond the range for which data is available
-E.g., cognitive capacity does not continue to increase linearly with age after age 18



## Heterogenous samples

- Sub-samples (e.g., males \& females) may artificially increase or decrease overall r.
- Solution - calculate separately for subsamples \& overall, look for differences
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Scatterplot of Same-sex \& Opposite-sex Relations by Gender

Opp Sex Relations
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Scatterplot of Weight and Selfesteem by Gender
$\widehat{\sigma} r=.50$
$q r=-.48$

$\qquad$

Dealing with several correlations

Dealing with several correlations
Scatterplot matrices organise scatterplots and correlations amongst several variables at once.

However, they are not detailed over for more than about five


Correlation matrix:
Example of an APA Style Correlation Table

Table 1.
Correlations Between Five Life Effectiveness Factors for Adolescents and Aduls ( $\mathrm{N}=3640$ )

|  | Time <br> Manage- <br> ment | Social <br> Compet- <br> ence | Achieve- <br> ment <br> Motivation | Intellectual <br> Flexibility | Task <br> Leadership |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Time Management |  | .36 | .53 | .31 | .42 |
| Social Competence |  |  | .37 | .32 | .57 |
| Achievement Motivation |  |  |  | .42 | .41 |
| Intellectual Flexibility |  |  |  |  | .37 |
| Task Leadership |  |  |  |  |  |



Summary
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## Key points

1. Covariations are the building blocks of more complex analyses, e.g., reliability analysis, factor analysis, multiple regression
2. Correlation does not prove causation - may be in opposite direction, co-causal, or due to other variables.

## Key points

3. Choose measure of correlation and graphs based on levels of measurement.
4. Check graphs (e.g., scatterplot):
-Outliers?
-Linear?
-Range?
-Homoscedasticity?
-Sub-samples to consider?

## Key points

5. Consider effect size (e.g., $\Phi$, Cramer's $V, r, r^{2}$ ) and direction of relationship
6. Conduct inferential test (if needed).
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## Key points

7. Interpret/Discuss

- Relate back to research hypothesis
- Describe \& interpret correlation (direction, size, significance)


## - Acknowledge limitations e.g.,

- Heterogeneity (sub-samples)
- Range restriction
- Causality?
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## Open Office Impress

- This presentation was made using Open Office Impress.
- Free and open source software.
- http://www.openoffice.org/product/impress.html


