

GPTS Invariance testing Joachim_Kowalski

Jan Szczypiński

08 10 2021

First the MI analysis of GPTS

```
## This is lavaan 0.6-8
## lavaan is FREE software! Please report any bugs.

##

## #####

## This is semTools 0.5-4

## All users of R (or SEM) are invited to submit functions or ideas for functions.

## #####
```

recoding variables in dataset 2 and 3

```
library(dplyr)

##
## Attaching package: 'dplyr'

## The following objects are masked from 'package:stats':
##
##   filter, lag

## The following objects are masked from 'package:base':
##
##   intersect, setdiff, setequal, union

d1 = subset(d, badanie ==1)
d2 = subset(d, badanie ==2)
d3 = subset(d, badanie ==3)

d2 = d2 %>%
  mutate_at(vars(1:18),
    ~factor(recode(.,
```

```

      "1"=0,
      "2"=1,
      "3"=2,
      "4"=3,
      "5"=4)),ordered=T)

d3 = d3 %>%
  mutate_at(vars(1:18),
    ~factor(recode(.,
      "1"=0,
      "2"=1,
      "3"=2,
      "4"=3,
      "5"=4)),ordered=T)

d = rbind(d1,d2)
d = rbind(d,d3)
colnames(d)[1] = 'PartA_gptsa1'

```

We create a matrix to compare fit indices across models with different constraints

```
all.results<-matrix(NA, nrow = 4, ncol = 6)
```

##Configural invariance

We follow the Wu and Estabrook (2016) procedure for calculating invariance for models with variables on categorical scale We use delta parametrization. Groups are split based on psychiatric diagnosis (yes/no);

First we create a syntax for a configural (baseline) model using semTools package

```

model5 = 'reference =~ PartA_gptsa1 + PartA_gptsa2 +PartA_gptsa3 + PartA_gptsa4 +
  PartA_gptsa5 + PartA_gptsa6 + PartA_gptsa7

  persecutory =~ partB_gptsb1 + partB_gptsb2 + partB_gptsb3 + partB_gptsb4 +
  partB_gptsb5 + partB_gptsb6 + partB_gptsb7 + partB_gptsb8 + partB_gptsb9 +
  partB_gptsb10
partB_gptsb2 ~~ partB_gptsb4
partB_gptsb3 ~~ partB_gptsb4
partB_gptsb2 ~~ partB_gptsb3'

MI_syntax_conf = measEq.syntax(configural.model = model5, data = d, ordered = TRUE,
  ID.cat = 'Wu.2016', ID.fac = 'unit.variance', parameterization = 'delta',
  group = "diag", group.equal = 'configural')

```

Next, we fit the configural (baseline model). If the fit indices are ok (Hu and Bentler, 1999) we assume configural invariance

```

cfa.config = cfa(as.character(MI_syntax_conf), data = d, estimator = "WLSMV",
  group = "diag", missing = 'listwise', ordered = TRUE)
fitmeasures(cfa.config,c('chisq.scaled','df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled',
  'rmsea.scaled','srmr'))

```

##	chisq.scaled	df.scaled	cfi.scaled	tli.scaled	rmsea.scaled	srmr
##	511.573	230.000	0.988	0.986	0.053	0.040

We write the fit indices to the matrix created earlier.

```
all.results[1,] =round(data.matrix((fitmeasures(cfa.config,c('chisq.scaled',  
  'df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled','rmsea.scaled','srmr')))), digits = 4)
```

##Threshold invariance First, we create a syntax for a model with thresholds constrain.

```
MI_syntax_thresh = measEq.syntax(configural.model = model5, data = d, ordered = TRUE,  
  ID.cat = 'Wu.2016', ID.fac = 'unit.variance', parameterization = 'delta',  
  group = "diag", group.equal = 'thresholds')
```

Next, we fit the model and save fit indices to the matrix

```
cfa.thresholds <- cfa(as.character(MI_syntax_thresh), data = d, estimator = "WLSMV",  
  group = "diag", missing = 'listwise', ordered = TRUE)  
all.results[2,] =round(data.matrix((fitmeasures(cfa.thresholds,c('chisq.scaled',  
  'df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled','rmsea.scaled','srmr')))),digits = 4)
```

Finally we compare baseline model and threshold model using Satorra-Bentler Scaled χ^2 difference test

```
robust_diff(cfa.thresholds,cfa.config)
```

```
##      Test statistic   p.value  
## [1,]          39.004 0.2548234
```

We see that the models do not differ significantly, thus we can assume threshold invariance.

##Metric invariance

First, we create a syntax for a model with thresholds and loadings constrains.

```
MI_syntax_metric = measEq.syntax(configural.model = model5, data = d, ordered = TRUE,  
  ID.cat = 'Wu.2016', ID.fac = 'unit.variance', parameterization = 'delta',  
  group = "diag", group.equal = c('thresholds','loadings'))
```

Next, we fit the model and save fit indices to the matrix

```
cfa.metric <- cfa(as.character(MI_syntax_metric), data = d, estimator = "WLSMV",  
  group = "diag", missing = 'listwise', ordered = TRUE)  
all.results[3,] =round(data.matrix((fitmeasures(cfa.metric,c('chisq.scaled',  
  'df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled','rmsea.scaled','srmr')))),digits = 4)
```

Finally we compare metric model and threshold model using Satorra-Bentler Scaled χ^2 difference test

```
robust_diff(cfa.metric,cfa.thresholds)
```

```
##      Test statistic   p.value  
## [1,]          9.159807 0.8690144
```

Again the test was not significant so we assume metric invariance and proceed to the last step

##Scalar invariance

First, we create a syntax for a model with thresholds, loadings, and intercepts constrains.

```
MI_syntax_scalar = measEq.syntax(configural.model = model5, data = d, ordered = TRUE,
                                ID.cat = 'Wu.2016', ID.fac = 'unit.variance', parameterization = 'delta',
                                group = "diag", group.equal = c('thresholds','loadings','intercepts'))
```

Next, we fit the model and save fit indices to the matrix

```
cfa.scalar <- cfa(as.character(MI_syntax_scalar), data = d, estimator = "WLSMV",
                 group = "diag", missing = 'listwise', ordered = TRUE)

all.results[4,] = round(data.matrix((fitmeasures(cfa.scalar,c('chisq.scaled',
'df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled','rmsea.scaled','srmr')))),digits =4)
```

Finally we compare scalar model and metric model model using Satorra-Bentler Scaled χ^2 difference test

```
robust_diff(cfa.scalar,cfa.metric)
```

```
##      Test statistic    p.value
## [1,]      26.11184 0.03686339
```

```
colnames(all.results) = c('chisq.scaled',
                          'df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled','rmsea.scaled','srmr')
print(all.results)
```

```
##      chisq.scaled df.scaled cfi.scaled tli.scaled rmsea.scaled  srmr
## [1,]      511.5731      230      0.9882      0.9860      0.0533 0.0398
## [2,]      559.2644      264      0.9876      0.9873      0.0509 0.0398
## [3,]      555.3126      279      0.9884      0.9887      0.0479 0.0398
## [4,]      573.5197      294      0.9883      0.9892      0.0469 0.0404
```

The test was significant, thus we can't assume scalar invariance. The next step is to explore which constrained parameter needs to be freed to improve the fit. We use `lavTestScore` function to print the parameters which have the most influence on the model

```
param = lavTestScore(cfa.scalar)$uni
```

```
## Warning in lavTestScore(cfa.scalar): lavaan WARNING: se is not 'standard'; not
## implemented yet; falling back to ordinary score test
```

```
head(param[order(param$X2,decreasing =T),],10)
```

```
##
## univariate score tests:
##
##      lhs op      rhs      X2 df p.value
```

```
## 2 .p2. == .p146. 16.333 1 0.000
## 1 .p1. == .p145. 9.281 1 0.002
## 22 .p22. == .p166. 8.525 1 0.004
## 23 .p23. == .p167. 5.091 1 0.024
## 19 .p19. == .p163. 4.626 1 0.031
## 9 .p9. == .p153. 4.098 1 0.043
## 14 .p14. == .p158. 3.562 1 0.059
## 50 .p50. == .p194. 3.461 1 0.063
## 20 .p20. == .p164. 3.365 1 0.067
## 10 .p10. == .p154. 3.241 1 0.072
```

We need to use the parTable function to see what parameter numbers mean

```
head(parTable(cfa.scalar),10)
```

```
##      id      lhs op      rhs user block group free ustart exo      label
## 1      1 reference == PartA_gptsa1      1      1      1      1      NA      0 lambda.1_1
## 2      2 reference == PartA_gptsa2      1      1      1      2      NA      0 lambda.2_1
## 3      3 reference == PartA_gptsa3      1      1      1      3      NA      0 lambda.3_1
## 4      4 reference == PartA_gptsa4      1      1      1      4      NA      0 lambda.4_1
## 5      5 reference == PartA_gptsa5      1      1      1      5      NA      0 lambda.5_1
## 6      6 reference == PartA_gptsa6      1      1      1      6      NA      0 lambda.6_1
## 7      7 reference == PartA_gptsa7      1      1      1      7      NA      0 lambda.7_1
## 8      8 persecutory == partB_gptsb1      1      1      1      8      NA      0 lambda.8_2
## 9      9 persecutory == partB_gptsb2      1      1      1      9      NA      0 lambda.9_2
## 10    10 persecutory == partB_gptsb3      1      1      1     10      NA      0 lambda.10_2
##      plabel start est se
## 1      .p1. 0.835 0.789 0.025
## 2      .p2. 0.841 0.835 0.021
## 3      .p3. 0.711 0.725 0.026
## 4      .p4. 0.945 0.908 0.014
## 5      .p5. 0.797 0.819 0.021
## 6      .p6. 0.838 0.848 0.020
## 7      .p7. 0.679 0.765 0.025
## 8      .p8. 0.881 0.832 0.022
## 9      .p9. 0.889 0.893 0.025
## 10    .p10. 0.845 0.844 0.019
```

We see that freeing the reference == PartA_gptsa2 parameter improves the model fit the most

#Partial invariance

We will free the preference == PartA_gptsa2 parameter and try to establish a partial scalar invariance

First, we create a syntax for a model with thresholds, loadings, and intercepts constraints.

```
MI_syntax_partial = measEq.syntax(configural.model = model15, data = d, ordered = TRUE,
                                   ID.cat = 'Wu.2016', ID.fac = 'unit.variance', parameterization = 'delta',
                                   group = "diag", group.equal = c('thresholds','loadings','intercepts'),
                                   group.partial = c('reference == PartA_gptsa2'))
```

Next, we fit the model and save fit indices to the matrix

```
cfa.partial <- cfa(as.character(MI_syntax_partial), data = d, estimator = "WLSMV",
  group = "diag", missing = 'listwise', ordered = TRUE)

all.results = rbind(all.results,round((fitmeasures(cfa.partial,c('chisq.scaled',
  'df.scaled','cfi.scaled','tli.scaled','rmsea.scaled','srmr'))),digits =4))
```

Finally we compare partial scalar model and metric model using Satorra-Bentler Scaled χ^2 difference test

```
robust_diff(cfa.partial,cfa.metric)
```

```
##      Test statistic  p.value
## [1,]      18.89233 0.1691045
```

```
print(all.results)
```

```
##      chisq.scaled df.scaled cfi.scaled tli.scaled rmsea.scaled  srmr
## [1,]      511.5731      230      0.9882      0.9860      0.0533 0.0398
## [2,]      559.2644      264      0.9876      0.9873      0.0509 0.0398
## [3,]      555.3126      279      0.9884      0.9887      0.0479 0.0398
## [4,]      573.5197      294      0.9883      0.9892      0.0469 0.0404
## [5,]      556.0204      293      0.9890      0.9898      0.0456 0.0402
```

We now see that there is no difference present between model with released reference \sim PartA_gptsa2 parameter. Thus, we can establish partial scalar invariance.