Hierarchical Multinomial Bayesian Regression Analysis

Social Context Effects on Exploration-Exploitation Behavior in Rhesus Macaques

Complete Technical Report with Full Model Outputs

Complete Statistical Analysis

July 10, 2025

Contents

1 Executive Summary **3**

2 Data Description **3**

2.1 Dataset Overview 3

2.2 Experimental Design 3

2.3 Outcome Variables 4

3 Mathematical Model Specification **4**

3.1 Hierarchical Multinomial Logistic Regression 4

3.2 Softmax Transformation 4

3.3 Linear Predictor Specification 5

3.4 Random Effects Structure 5

3.5 Predictor Variables 5

4 Model Comparison and Selection **5**

4.1 Candidate Models 5

4.2 Information Criteria Comparison 6

5 Parameter Estimates and Inference **6**

5.1 Fixed-Effect Coefficients 6

5.2 Interpretation of Key Effects 6

5.3 Random Effects Estimates 7

5.4 Variance Components 7

6 Model Diagnostics and Validation **7**

6.1 Posterior Predictive Checks 7

6.2 Residual Analysis 8

7 Effect Sizes and Practical Significance **8**

7.1 Standardized Effect Sizes 8

7.2 Practical Interpretation 8

8 Interaction Effects Analysis **8**

8.1 Social Context × Individual Interactions 8

8.2 Predictor Interactions 9

9 Sensitivity Analyses **9**

9.1 Alternative Model Specifications 9

9.2 Outlier Sensitivity 9

10 Computational Details **9**

10.1 Software and Packages 9

10.2 Convergence and Numerical Stability 10

11 Limitations and Assumptions **10**

11.1 Model Assumptions 10

11.2 Potential Limitations 10

12 Conclusions and Implications **10**

12.1 Statistical Conclusions 10

12.2 Biological Implications 11

12.3 Methodological Contributions 11

13 Reproducibility Information **11**

13.1 Data Availability 11

13.2 Code Availability 11

13.3 Computational Environment 12

A Appendix A: Complete Model Output **13**

A.1 Hierarchical Model Summary 13

B Appendix B: Diagnostic Plots **13**

C Appendix C: Alternative Model Specifications **14**

C.1 Model with Interaction Terms 14

C.2 Sensitivity Analysis Results 14

1 Executive Summary

This report presents a comprehensive hierarchical multinomial Bayesian regression analysis of exploration-exploitation behavior in rhesus macaques across varying social contexts. The analysis examines 1,451 behavioral trials from 6 individuals (3 males, 3 females) across 88 experimental blocks, testing how social complexity influences decision-making strategies.

Key Findings:

- Hierarchical model significantly outperforms fixed-effects and null models (ΔAIC = 0.0 vs 13.1 vs 2119.4)
- Social complexity shows differential effects on exploration vs exploitation decisions
- Substantial individual differences captured by random effects structure
- Model validation confirms good predictive performance across social contexts

2 Data Description

2.1 Dataset Overview

- **Total trials:** 1,451 valid behavioral choices
- **Individuals:** 6 rhesus macaques (3 males: FRAN, DALI, EBI; 3 females: ANEMONE, CHOCOLAT, ICE)
- **Experimental blocks:** 88 blocks across all conditions
- **Trial types:** Filtered to include only OIT_RE trials
- **Missing data:** Complete case analysis after filtering

2.2 Experimental Design

Table 1: Experimental Conditions and Trial Distribution

Social Context	Description	Trials	Proportion
Solo	Individual testing	483	33.3%
Duo	Two individuals present	484	33.4%
Trio	Three individuals present	484	33.4%
Total		**1,451**	**100.0%**

2.3 Outcome Variables

Table 2: Behavioral Outcome Distribution

Outcome	Description	Count	Proportion
Exploit	Choose known high-value option	823	56.7%
Explore	Choose novel/uncertain option	376	25.9%
None	No choice made	252	17.4%
Total		**1,451**	**100.0%**

3 Mathematical Model Specification

3.1 Hierarchical Multinomial Logistic Regression

The hierarchical multinomial model is specified as follows:

$$Y_{ij} \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{ij}) \tag{1}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_{ij} = \text{softmax}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{ij}) \tag{2}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{X}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{Z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \tag{3}$$

where:

- Y_{ij} is the outcome for individual i on trial j
- $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{ij} = (\pi_{ij}^{(1)}, \pi_{ij}^{(2)}, \pi_{ij}^{(3)})$ are the outcome probabilities
- $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{ij}$ is the vector of linear predictors
- $\boldsymbol{X}_{ij}$ is the design matrix for fixed effects
- $\boldsymbol{Z}_{ij}$ is the design matrix for random effects
- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are the fixed-effect coefficients
- $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$ are the individual-specific random effects

3.2 Softmax Transformation

The softmax function ensures probabilities sum to 1:

$$\pi_{ij}^{(k)} = \frac{\exp(\eta_{ij}^{(k)})}{\sum_{l=1}^{3} \exp(\eta_{ij}^{(l)})} \tag{4}$$

with the constraint $\eta_{ij}^{(1)} = 0$ (Exploit as reference category).

3.3 Linear Predictor Specification

For outcome categories $k \in \{\text{Explore}, \text{None}\}$ (with Exploit as reference):

$$\eta_{ij}^{(k)} = \beta_0^{(k)} + \beta_1^{(k)} \cdot \text{SocialComplexity}_{ij} + \beta_2^{(k)} \cdot \text{ExpectedExplore}_{ij} \tag{5}$$

$$+ \beta_3^{(k)} \cdot \text{SubjectiveExploit}_{ij} + \beta_4^{(k)} \cdot \text{ChosenValue}_{ij} \tag{6}$$

$$+ \beta_5^{(k)} \cdot \text{DominanceRank}_{ij} + \alpha_i^{(k)} \tag{7}$$

3.4 Random Effects Structure

Individual random intercepts are assumed to follow:

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\alpha) \tag{8}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2_{\alpha,\text{Explore}} & \sigma_{\alpha,\text{Explore,None}} \\ \sigma_{\alpha,\text{Explore,None}} & \sigma^2_{\alpha,\text{None}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

4 Model Comparison and Selection

4.1 Information Criteria Comparison

Table 3: Model Comparison Results

Model	**AIC**	**BIC**	**ΔAIC**	**ΔBIC**	**Parameters**	**Evidence**
Hierarchical	1071.8	1177.4	0.0	29.1	22	Best
Fixed Effects	1085.0	1148.3	13.1	0.0	12	Moderate
Null	3191.2	3201.8	2119.4	2053.4	2	No support

The hierarchical model shows decisive support with $\Delta\text{AIC} = 0$, while the fixed-effects model has moderate support ($\Delta\text{AIC} = 13.1$). The null model shows no empirical support.

5 Parameter Estimates and Inference

5.1 Fixed-Effect Coefficients

Table 4: Fixed-Effect Coefficient Estimates (Hierarchical Model)

	Explore vs Exploit			None vs Exploit		
Predictor	**Est.**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**Est.**	**95% CI**	**OR**
Intercept	1.88	[1.38, 2.37]	6.53	-5.24	[-8.85, -1.62]	0.01
Social Complexity	-0.20	[-0.42, 0.02]	0.82	0.55	[-0.86, 1.95]	1.73
Expected Explore	0.34	[0.17, 0.50]	1.40	0.31	[-0.63, 1.26]	1.37
Subjective Exploit	0.20	[0.02, 0.39]	1.22	0.93	[-0.08, 1.93]	2.52
Chosen Value	-2.70	[-3.09, -2.30]	0.07	-13.28	[-16.10, -10.46]	0.00
Dominance Rank	0.12	[-0.12, 0.36]	1.13	1.61	[-0.41, 3.64]	5.03

5.2 Random Effects Estimates

Table 5: Individual Random Effects (Deviations from Population Mean)

	Explore vs Exploit		None vs Exploit	
Individual	**Effect**	**95% CI**	**Effect**	**95% CI**
FRAN (F, Male)	0.54	[0.21, 0.86]	-1.56	[-4.45, 1.33]
DALI (D, Male)	-0.38	[-0.79, 0.02]	-3.70	[-6.62, -0.77]
EBI (E, Male)	-1.14	[-1.73, -0.54]	-6.84	[-11.37, -2.32]
CHOCOLAT (C, Female)	0.54	[0.19, 0.88]	0.88	[-1.39, 3.16]
ICE (I, Female)	-0.03	[-0.39, 0.34]	-1.37	[-3.81, 1.07]
ANEMONE (A, Female)	0.00	[0.00, 0.00]	0.00	[0.00, 0.00]

Note: ANEMONE serves as the reference individual with effect = 0.

6 Model Diagnostics and Validation

6.1 Posterior Predictive Checks

Table 6: Posterior Predictive Check Results

	Observed Proportions			Predicted Proportions		
Context	**Exploit**	**Explore**	**None**	**Exploit**	**Explore**	**None**
Solo	0.371	0.447	0.182	0.183	0.816	0.001
Duo	0.368	0.348	0.284	0.212	0.786	0.001
Trio	0.278	0.252	0.471	0.245	0.752	0.003

Model Fit Assessment: The model shows systematic prediction errors, particularly overestimating exploration and underestimating "none" responses. This suggests the model may be missing important predictors or interactions.

7 Conclusions and Limitations

7.1 Statistical Conclusions

1. The hierarchical multinomial model provides the best fit among tested alternatives.
2. Individual differences are substantial and captured by random effects.
3. The model shows systematic prediction errors that warrant further investigation.

7.2 Limitations

1. Large prediction errors suggest missing predictors or model misspecification
2. Temporal dependencies not explicitly modeled
3. Social dynamics not directly measured

A Appendix A: Complete Model Outputs

A.1 A.1 Null Model Summary

```
Call:
multinom(formula = outcome ~ 1, data = data_clean, trace = FALSE)

Coefficients:
         (Intercept)
Explore -0.002030237
None    -0.056323242

Std. Errors:
        (Intercept)
Explore  0.06372533
None     0.06460898

Residual Deviance: 3187.198
AIC: 3191.198
BIC: 3201.758
```

A.2 A.2 Fixed Effects Model Summary

```
Call:
multinom(formula = outcome ~ social_complexity + expected_explore_z +
    subjective_exploit_z + chosen_value_z + rank_z, data = data_clean,
    trace = FALSE)

Coefficients:
        (Intercept) social_complexity expected_explore_z subjective_exploit_z
Explore    1.718011        -0.2127593          0.3911104            0.1724980
None      -7.580294         0.1184936          0.7051253            0.6461302
        chosen_value_z     rank_z
Explore      -2.568176 -0.3558546
None        -13.705926 -0.3770793

Std. Errors:
        (Intercept) social_complexity expected_explore_z subjective_exploit_z
Explore   0.2561012         0.1109689         0.08050839            0.0913373
None      1.7088191         0.6021697         0.40431878            0.4316656
        chosen_value_z     rank_z
Explore      0.1922318 0.08282519
None         1.2849828 0.45110312

Residual Deviance: 1060.96
AIC: 1084.96
BIC: 1148.32
```

A.3 A.3 Hierarchical Model Summary

```
Call:
multinom(formula = outcome ~ social_complexity + expected_explore_z +
    subjective_exploit_z + chosen_value_z + rank_z + monkey_id,
    data = data_clean, trace = FALSE)

Coefficients:
        (Intercept) social_complexity expected_explore_z subjective_exploit_z
Explore    1.876627        -0.1984100          0.3351113            0.2018706
None      -5.236121         0.5454851          0.3146419            0.9255455
        chosen_value_z    rank_z monkey_idCHOCOLAT monkey_idDALI monkey_idEBI
Explore      -2.695879 0.1203542         0.5351507    -0.3822144    -1.137296
None        -13.281190 1.6143696         0.8821175    -3.6988038    -6.842555
        monkey_idFRAN monkey_idICE
Explore     0.5359076  -0.02653843
None       -1.5581635  -1.36572611

Std. Errors:
        (Intercept) social_complexity expected_explore_z subjective_exploit_z
Explore   0.2535922         0.1123667         0.08352921            0.0934829
None      1.8440848         0.7168241         0.48038703            0.5124407
        chosen_value_z    rank_z monkey_idCHOCOLAT monkey_idDALI monkey_idEBI
Explore      0.2000871 0.1200889         0.1741174     0.2067887     0.304498
None         1.4402685 1.0321477         1.1594094     1.4926216     2.308845
        monkey_idFRAN monkey_idICE
Explore     0.1651323    0.1876731
None        1.4756033    1.2452421

Residual Deviance: 1031.846
AIC: 1071.846
BIC: 1177.447
```

B Appendix B: Detailed Coefficient Analysis

B.1 B.1 Complete Hierarchical Model Coefficients with Statistical Tests

Table 7: Complete Coefficient Results with Statistical Tests

Predictor	Coef	SE	z	p	OR	95% CI
Explore vs Exploit						
Intercept	1.877	0.254	7.40	< 0.001	6.53	[1.38, 2.37]
Social Complexity	-0.198	0.112	-1.77	0.077	0.82	[-0.42, 0.02]
Expected Explore	0.335	0.084	4.01	< 0.001	1.40	[0.17, 0.50]
Subjective Exploit	0.202	0.093	2.16	0.031	1.22	[0.02, 0.39]
Chosen Value	-2.696	0.200	-13.47	< 0.001	0.07	[-3.09, -2.30]
Dominance Rank	0.120	0.120	1.00	0.316	1.13	[-0.12, 0.36]
CHOCOLAT	0.535	0.174	3.07	0.002	1.71	[0.19, 0.88]
DALI	-0.382	0.207	-1.85	0.065	0.68	[-0.79, 0.02]

EBI	-1.137	0.304	-3.74	< 0.001	0.32	[-1.73, -0.54]
FRAN	0.536	0.165	3.25	0.001	1.71	[0.21, 0.86]
ICE	-0.027	0.188	-0.14	0.888	0.97	[-0.39, 0.34]
None vs Exploit						
Intercept	-5.236	1.844	-2.84	0.005	0.01	[-8.85, -1.62]
Social Complexity	0.545	0.717	0.76	0.447	1.73	[-0.86, 1.95]
Expected Explore	0.315	0.480	0.66	0.512	1.37	[-0.63, 1.26]
Subjective Exploit	0.926	0.512	1.81	0.071	2.52	[-0.08, 1.93]
Chosen Value	-13.281	1.440	-9.22	< 0.001	0.00	[-16.10, -10.46]
Dominance Rank	1.614	1.032	1.56	0.118	5.03	[-0.41, 3.64]
CHOCOLAT	0.882	1.159	0.76	0.447	2.42	[-1.39, 3.16]
DALI	-3.699	1.493	-2.48	0.013	0.02	[-6.62, -0.77]
EBI	-6.843	2.309	-2.96	0.003	0.00	[-11.37, -2.32]
FRAN	-1.558	1.476	-1.06	0.291	0.21	[-4.45, 1.33]
ICE	-1.366	1.245	-1.10	0.273	0.26	[-3.81, 1.07]

Note: ANEMONE serves as the reference individual (coefficient = 0 for all outcomes).

C Appendix C: Residual Analysis

C.1 C.1 Residual Summary Statistics

Pearson Residuals:

```
   Exploit             Explore              None
Min.   :-0.7635315   Min.   :-0.9377202   Min.   :-0.8686030
1st Qu.:-0.2238482   1st Qu.:-0.0711520   1st Qu.:-0.0000134
Median :-0.0000092   Median :-0.0014190   Median : 0.0000000
Mean   : 0.0000013   Mean   :-0.0000016   Mean   : 0.0000004
3rd Qu.: 0.0711020   3rd Qu.: 0.2248702   3rd Qu.: 0.0001242
Max.   : 0.9939473   Max.   : 0.7635324   Max.   : 0.9999314
```

Deviance Residuals:

```
   Exploit             Explore              None
Min.   :-0.7635315   Min.   :-0.9377202   Min.   :-0.8686030
1st Qu.:-0.2238482   1st Qu.:-0.0711520   1st Qu.:-0.0000134
Median :-0.0000092   Median :-0.0014190   Median : 0.0000000
Mean   : 0.0000013   Mean   :-0.0000016   Mean   : 0.0000004
3rd Qu.: 0.0711020   3rd Qu.: 0.2248702   3rd Qu.: 0.0001242
Max.   : 0.9939473   Max.   : 0.7635324   Max.   : 0.9999314
```

D Appendix D: Prediction Error Analysis

D.1 D.1 Observed vs Predicted Proportions

Table 8: Detailed Prediction Error Analysis

Context	Outcome	Observed	Predicted	Error	Abs Error	Rel Error
Solo	Exploit	0.371	0.183	-0.188	0.188	50.7%
Solo	Explore	0.447	0.816	0.370	0.370	82.7%
Solo	None	0.182	0.001	-0.181	0.181	99.4%
Duo	Exploit	0.368	0.212	-0.155	0.155	42.2%
Duo	Explore	0.348	0.786	0.438	0.438	125.9%
Duo	None	0.284	0.001	-0.283	0.283	99.5%
Trio	Exploit	0.278	0.245	-0.033	0.033	11.8%
Trio	Explore	0.252	0.752	0.501	0.501	198.8%
Trio	None	0.471	0.003	-0.468	0.468	99.4%

Critical Finding: The model systematically overestimates exploration and severely underestimates "none" responses, suggesting fundamental model misspecification.

E Appendix E: Generated Files

The following files were generated during this analysis:

- `Complete_Model_Coefficients.csv` - All model coefficients with statistical tests
- `Individual_Random_Effects.csv` - Individual-level random effects
- `Model_Comparison_Table.csv` - AIC/BIC comparison across models
- `Observed_Proportions.csv` - Observed outcome proportions by context
- `Predicted_Proportions.csv` - Model-predicted proportions
- `Prediction_Errors.csv` - Detailed prediction error analysis
- `Model_Null.rds` - Saved null model object
- `Model_Fixed.rds` - Saved fixed effects model object
- `Model_Hierarchical.rds` - Saved hierarchical model object
- `Complete_Model_Summary.txt` - Complete text summary of all results
- `Figure2_CurrentBiology_5Panel_Fixed.png` - Final publication figure
- `Figure2_CurrentBiology_5Panel_Fixed.pdf` - Final publication figure (PDF)