



Advances in Stochastic Models for Animal Movement and Assessment of Attitudes Toward Probability

link to slides

Elizabeth Eisenhauer


Co-advisors: Ephraim Hanks & Matthew Beckman



Outline


1

A Lattice and Random
Intermediate Point Sampling
Design for Animal Movement



2

Modeling Yearly Patterns in
Golden Eagle Movement



3

Survey of Attitudes toward
Probability




A Lattice and Random Intermediate Point (LARI) Sampling Design for Animal Movement

Hughes lab at Penn State collected **high resolution ant data**, but data collection was **time-consuming** (1000s of student-hours).



4 hours of movement data
78 ants
1 second intervals

The resulting dataset consists of **4 hours** of movement data for **78 ants** at 1 second intervals (14,401 observations per ant).



Each color is one individual.



We were approached by the researchers with the **scenario**:

Next time, we will collect **lower resolution** data.


We want to know how best to collect this data.

This question is **relevant to many researchers** collecting animal movement data.

Sampling at **regular time intervals** can hide important information about the speed and tortuosity of the path.



In geostatistics, researchers often adopt a **lattice plus close pairs** design over a lattice alone or a lattice and infill approach.



(Diggle and Lophaven, 2006)


We **propose a sampling scheme** for animal telemetry data inspired by the lattice plus close pairs geostatistical design.

2 sampling designs:

REGULAR




LATTICE AND RANDOM INTERMEDIATE POINT (LARI)



To compare regular and LARI sampling designs,
we look at **4 subsamples** of the ant data.


Full data




Every 3s



Every 5s



Lattice and Random intermediate point (LARI) 10s



Every 5s and LARI 10s
have the same number of
data points


To **model movement at an individual level**, we use basic concepts from physics.

\mathbf{r}_t = position

\mathbf{v}_t = velocity


\mathbf{a}_t = acceleration

This ant is slowing down



$$\mathbf{F}_t = m\mathbf{a}_t$$

So modeling acceleration is the same as **modeling “force”** acting on an animal.



The **2** main equations for this model

The derivative of position with respect to time is velocity.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_t}{dt} = \mathbf{v}_t \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad d\mathbf{r}_t = \mathbf{v}_t dt$$

The derivative of velocity with respect to time is acceleration.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}_t}{dt} = \mathbf{a}_t \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad d\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{a}_t dt$$

The **2** main equations for this model

To model animal movement, we use

$$d\mathbf{r}_t = \mathbf{v}_t dt$$

and rewrite acceleration as a sum of forces

$$d\mathbf{v}_t = \boxed{\beta (\mu(\mathbf{r}_t) - \mathbf{v}_t) dt} + \boxed{c(\mathbf{r}_t) \mathbf{I} d\mathbf{w}_t}$$

mean-reverting force

random force

Stochastic differential equation (SDE) model for animal movement

Data: \mathbf{r}_t , $t = 1, 2, \dots, 14401$ for each ant

SDE model framework:

$$d\mathbf{r}_t = \mathbf{v}_t dt$$



$$d\mathbf{v}_t = \beta (\mu(\mathbf{r}_t) - \mathbf{v}_t) dt + c(\mathbf{r}_t) \mathbf{I} d\mathbf{w}_t$$

Utilizing motility and potential surfaces, define:


$$\mu(\mathbf{r}_t) = \textcolor{brown}{m}(\mathbf{r}_t) [- \nabla p(\mathbf{r}_t)] \quad (\text{mean drift})$$

$$c(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sigma \textcolor{brown}{m}(\mathbf{r}_t) \quad (\text{magnitude of stochasticity})$$

We describe animal movement using a stochastic differential equation model with 2 parameters: **potential** and motility



We describe animal movement using a stochastic differential equation model with 2 parameters: potential and **motility**



Since we don't observe animal movement in continuous time, we **numerically approximate derivatives** (Euler-Maruyama method).

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}_\tau}{dt} \approx \frac{\mathbf{r}_{\tau+1} - \mathbf{r}_\tau}{h_\tau}$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}_\tau}{dt} \approx \frac{\mathbf{v}_{\tau+1} - \mathbf{v}_\tau}{h_\tau} \approx \frac{\mathbf{r}_{\tau+2} - \mathbf{r}_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau h_{\tau+1}} - \frac{\mathbf{r}_{\tau+1} - \mathbf{r}_\tau}{h_\tau^2}$$



Note that this works for data that is irregular in time.

where

- $\mathbf{r}_\tau = [x_\tau \ y_\tau]'$ is the position of ordered observation τ
- \mathbf{v}_τ is the (unobserved) velocity of observation τ
- h_τ is the change in time from observation τ to $\tau + 1$

Resulting in the **model equation**

$$\mathbf{r}_{\tau+2} = \left(1 + \frac{h_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau} - \beta h_{\tau+1} \right) \mathbf{r}_{\tau+1} + \left(\beta h_{\tau+1} - \frac{h_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau} \right) \mathbf{r}_\tau + \beta h_\tau h_{\tau+1} \color{orange} m(\mathbf{r}_\tau) [- \nabla p(\mathbf{r}_\tau)] + \sigma \color{orange} m(\mathbf{r}_\tau) h_{\tau+1} h_\tau^2 N(\mathbf{0}, I)$$

Recall:


- $\mathbf{r}_\tau = [x_\tau \ y_\tau]'$ is the position of ordered observation τ
- \mathbf{v}_τ is the (unobserved) velocity of observation τ
- h_τ is the change in time from observation τ to $\tau + 1$

Spline expansion (degree 0, piecewise constant) of the motility and potential surfaces

$$m(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sum_{j=1}^J m_j s_j(\mathbf{r}_\tau)$$

$$p(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sum_{j=1}^J p_j s_j(\mathbf{r}_\tau)$$

$$s_j(\mathbf{r}_\tau) \equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbf{r}_\tau \text{ in } j^{\text{th}} \text{ grid cell} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



Penalize the roughness of m and p

Smoothness parameters are chosen with a holdout set.

$$\mathbf{r}_{\tau+2} = \left(1 + \frac{h_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau} - \beta h_{\tau+1}\right) \mathbf{r}_{\tau+1} + \left(\beta h_{\tau+1} - \frac{h_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau}\right) \mathbf{r}_\tau + \beta h_\tau h_{\tau+1} \textcolor{red}{m(\mathbf{r}_\tau)} [- \nabla p(\mathbf{r}_\tau)] + \sigma \textcolor{red}{m(\mathbf{r}_\tau)} h_{\tau+1} h_\tau^2 N(\mathbf{0}, I)$$

Goal – Estimate $\mathbf{m} \equiv [m_1 \dots m_J]'$ and $\mathbf{p} \equiv [p_1 \dots p_J]'$ for J grid cells with an iterative approach:



1. Obtain a preliminary estimate of mean parameters (β and \mathbf{p}) assuming the motility surface is constant (model errors are i.i.d.).
2. Estimate the variance parameters (\mathbf{m}) using residuals from step 1.
3. Estimate mean parameters (β and \mathbf{p}) conditioned on the variance estimates from step 2.

Computing time **~20 minutes** (single core)

- 14,401 x 78 data points


We conducted a
simulation study to
quantify the bias in the
estimation procedure.

One of 500 simulations




True and estimated surfaces for one randomly selected simulation


(A) Estimated Potential Surface



(B) True Potential Surface



(C) Estimated Motility Surface




(D) True Motility Surface



We compared true and estimated motility and potential surfaces using multiple metrics.


We compare motility and potential surfaces estimated with the 4 subsamples using multiple metrics.




We compare motility and potential surfaces estimated with the 4 subsamples using multiple metrics.

POTENTIAL SURFACE


(A) Full Data




(B) Every 3 Seconds, $\text{MSD} = 18.1455$



(C) Every 5 Seconds, $\text{MSD} = 21.2761$




(D) 10 Second LARI, $\text{MSD} = 14.8337$




We fit 50 different LARI subsamples to understand random variation.

(A) Potential Surface MSD




(B) Log Motility Surface MSE



Result: **LARI sampling was better** than regular sampling overall for understanding movement behavior. A simulation study and additional data example support this conclusion. It may also be better for estimating missing data.

Conclusion: Regular sampling may not always be the best choice.




- **Eisenhauer**, Elizabeth, and Ephraim Hanks. "A lattice and random intermediate point sampling design for animal movement." *Environmetrics* (2020): e2618.
- Wijeyakulasuriya, D. A., **Eisenhauer**, E. W., Shaby, B. A., & Hanks, E. M. "Machine learning for modeling animal movement." *Plos one* 15.7 (2020): e0235750.




Modeling Yearly Patterns in Golden Eagle Movement

Golden eagles, like many species, display **partial migration**, meaning only some individuals in the population migrate.



Due to climate change, we can expect migration to change or become less common. Thus it is important that we can **identify** and **quantify** different movement strategies.

Current methods to classify movement strategies work best on the most stereotypical cases and are often in disagreement (Cagnacci et al., 2016).



Data collection funded by
the USFWS

68 eagles with at least 1 year
of data

Large variability in individual
movement behaviors

Each color is one individual

Big picture goals:

1. Relatively **simple** model (few parameters)
2. Capture the full range of movement behavior from **resident** to **migrant** to **dispersal**.
3. Use to **classify individuals** and better understand boundary individuals

We describe animal movement using a **stochastic differential equation (SDE)** model with a constant motility surface.

Data: \mathbf{r}_t , $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ for each eagle

SDE model framework:

$$d\mathbf{r}_t = \mathbf{v}_t dt$$

$$d\mathbf{v}_t = \beta (\mu(\mathbf{r}_t, t) - \mathbf{v}_t) dt + \sigma d\mathbf{w}_t$$

Utilizing a potential function, define:

$$\mu(\mathbf{r}_t, t) = - \nabla p(\mathbf{r}_t, t) \quad (\text{mean drift})$$


We again use **Euler-Maruyama** approximations.
We assume **regular time steps**.

Resulting model equation:

$$\mathbf{r}_{t+2} - 2\mathbf{r}_{t+1} + \mathbf{r}_t = \beta \left(-\nabla p(\mathbf{r}_t) - \mathbf{r}_{t+1} + \mathbf{r}_t \right) + \sigma \epsilon_t$$

where $p(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^4 k_{it} \sqrt{(x_t - a_{xi})^2 + (y_t - a_{yi})^2}$,

a weighted sum of distances to fixed k means attractors.



We want the coefficient of attraction k_{it} for attractor i to **change over time**.

Methods:

1. **Varying coefficient model** allows k_{it} to change smoothly over time.
2. **Latent-state model** allows k_{it} to switch between discrete values over time.
 - Note: The term latent-state model is used over HMM because of the feedback inherent in the model, i.e., \mathbf{r}_t depends on the previous 2 time points as well as the state at time t





Varying coefficient model:

1. k_{it} changes smoothly over time
2. Fit using **GAM** function in R
3. The **same model** for resident, migrant, and disperser


Latent-state model:

1. k_{it} switches between discrete values for each state
2. We fit each model in a **Bayesian framework**
 - We sample using the No U-Turn Sampler implemented in Stan

We will fit these models for 3 representative individuals





Resident: 4C.Cahone in 2015



Single-State Model for Resident

$m = 1$ attractor with coefficient of attraction $k_{1t} = k$

$$p(\mathbf{r}_t) = k \sqrt{(x_t - a_{x1})^2 + (y_t - a_{y1})^2}$$





Varying Coefficient Model for Resident



Fixed $m = 4$ attractors and k_{it} for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ changes smoothly over time.

$$p(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_{ij} B_j(t) \sqrt{(x_t - a_{xi})^2 + (y_t - a_{yi})^2}$$

where α_{ij} is the coefficient of the j^{th} cyclic cubic basis function $B_j(t)$ for attractor i




Simulations for resident




True path in blue & simulation in red


Dispersal: TP.N Zacatecas in 2018



Latent-State Model for Dispersal



$$p(\mathbf{r}_t, s_t) = k_{s_t} \sqrt{(x_t - a_{xs_t})^2 + (y_t - a_{ys_t})^2}$$




Varying Coefficient Model for Dispersal (identical to varying coefficient model for resident)

Fixed $m = 4$ attractors and k_{it} for $i = 1,2,3,4$
changes smoothly over time.


$$p(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_{ij} B_j(t) \sqrt{(x_t - a_{xi})^2 + (y_t - a_{yi})^2}$$

where α_{ij} is the coefficient of the j^{th} cyclic cubic basis function $B_j(t)$ for attractor i




Simulations for dispersal


A





B



Migrant: NM.Tredwell in 2012



Latent-State Model for Migration



Varying Coefficient Model for Migrant (identical to varying coefficient model for resident)


Fixed $m = 4$ attractors and k_{it} for $i = 1,2,3,4$
changes smoothly over time.

$$p(\mathbf{r}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_{ij} B_j(t) \sqrt{(x_t - a_{xi})^2 + (y_t - a_{yi})^2}$$

where α_{ij} is the coefficient of the j^{th} cyclic cubic basis function $B_j(t)$ for attractor i


Southern
migration

Northern
migration




Simulations for migrant

A




B



Future work:

1. **Classify** paths as migrant, resident, or disperser.
2. Make varying coefficient model more interpretable by **restricting attractor coefficients** to be positive
3. Fit varying coefficient model in a **Bayesian framework**
4. Fit **more individuals**, including some boundary individuals

Survey of Attitudes Toward Probability

A photograph of a classroom setting. In the foreground, a female teacher with long brown hair, wearing a dark blue top, stands facing a group of students. She has her right arm raised, palm open, as if asking a question or gesturing. The students are seated at their desks in rows, looking towards the teacher. The classroom has white walls and fluorescent lighting.

We provide one of the first assessments of students' attitudes about the subject of probability, called the **Survey of Attitudes toward Probability (SAP)**.

The SAP could be a **tool for researchers** to inform changes in probability courses.

Why do we care about students' attitudes toward probability?

- Probability is a **foundational course** for students interested in pursuing research or a degree in a quantitative field.
- Often the first or second course taken in the statistics department, and it can be a “**make or break**” course.
- **Not as well studied** as introductory statistics.

- ✓ Developed the SAP as an adaptation of the well-studied Survey of Attitudes Toward Statistics (**SATS-36**), informed by 3 think-alouds with **former students** and input from probability **instructors**.
- ✓ Obtained **IRB approval** in summer 2020.
- ✓ Coordinated survey distribution in **15 different sections** in the first and last 3 weeks of the fall 2020 semester.
- ✓ Ensured comparable incentive structures within all sections and worked with instructors to provide **extra credit** to students whether they consented to allowing their data to be used or not.
- ✓ Students who did not consent to their data being used completed an **alternative assignment**.

Each Likert survey question is associated with an **attitude component**, following Candice Schau's SATS-36:

- **Affect** (6 items) – e.g. “I will like probability.”
- **Cognitive Competence** (6 items) – e.g. “I can learn probability.”
- **Value** (9 items) – e.g. “Probability is worthless.”
- **Difficulty** (7 items) – e.g. “Probability is a complicated subject.”
- **Interest** (4 items) – e.g. “I am interested in learning probability.”
- **Effort** (3 items) – e.g. “I plan to work hard in my probability course.”


We **compare our results to the Schau (2012)** analysis of the SATS-36.

(2200 students enrolled in 101 sections of post-secondary introductory statistics service courses across the US)


Our sample: **343 Penn State students in 15 sections** completed both pre and post surveys.

Pre scores (section means are plotted)

Schau (2012) - Attitudes toward statistics




Us - Attitudes toward probability




Students who took our pre survey thought probability was **more difficult** and were **more interested** in the subject. This is compared to the introductory statistics students Schau surveyed on their attitudes toward statistics.

Post scores (section means are plotted)

Schau (2012)




Us



The trend described on the previous slide is also present in the post survey.


Change in scores (section means are plotted)

Schau (2012)



All attitude components had a slight mean **negative shift** from pre to post surveys in our data. This was true even for components with mean positive shifts in Schau's data.

Us



Future work:


1. **More detailed analyses** of this data.
 - **Demographic information** and math background could help explain variability.
 - Examine **open-ended questions**.
 - Assess the **internal consistency** of the SAP.
2. Collecting more data with an updated survey in **Spring 2021** from 20 sections, including 7 non-probability sections.
 - >600 responses to the pre SAP from probability sections

Thanks to all the instructors for their help!

Projects


1

A Lattice and Random
Intermediate Point Sampling
Design for Animal Movement



2

Modeling Yearly Patterns in
Golden Eagle Movement



3

Survey of Attitudes toward
Probability

