

Structural Equation Modeling

P.05 - Model Fit and Fit Indices (Note)

08.11.2021

Set the working directory to the location where your data file has been downloaded and load the data.

```
# For example.  
setwd("/Users/mihai/Downloads")  
  
# Load data.  
data <- read.csv("ELEM1.csv")  
  
# Inspect the data.  
View(data)
```

Note on the χ^2 difference value in the LRT.

You indicated that the χ^2 difference value in the LRT computation is not the same as the actual difference between the standard χ^2 reported by `lavaan` (e.g., during `model summary()`).

This seems to be the case because we estimated the models using the *Satorra Bentler* method. In this scenario, `lavaan` will use the standard χ^2 values, however it will apply a scaled test statistic using the `satorra.bentler.2001` method. This is mentioned both in the output of `lavTestLRT()` and the documentation for this function.

For example, if we run `lavTestLRT()`,

```
lavTestLRT(model_ex_1_fit, model_ex_1_modification_1_fit)
```

we see the following note:

Scaled Chi-Squared Difference Test (method = "satorra.bentler.2001")

lavaan NOTE:

The "Chisq" column contains standard test statistics, not the robust test that should be reported per model. A robust difference test is a function of two standard (not robust) statistics.

Then, in the documentation of `lavTestLRT()` we see the following:

```
?lavTestLRT
```

The `anova` function for `lavaan` objects simply calls the `lavTestLRT` function,

which has a few additional arguments.

If ``type = "Chisq"`` and the test statistics are scaled, a special scaled difference test statistic is computed. If method is ``"satorra.bentler.2001"``, a simple approximation is used described in Satorra & Bentler (2001). In some settings, this can lead to a negative test statistic. To ensure a positive test statistic, we can use the method proposed by Satorra & Bentler (2010). Alternatively, when method is ``"satorra.2000"``, the original formulas of Satorra (2000) are used.

We know that if we use the ML estimator, then the χ^2 difference value in the LRT should be in fact the difference between the standard χ^2 values. In our case, we expect this difference to be the result of adding another parameter to the model based on the modification indices. We can check this as follows:

```
# Model syntax model 1.
model_1 <- "
  # Measurement part.
  EMO =~ ITEM1 + ITEM2 + ITEM3 + ITEM6 + ITEM8 + ITEM13 + ITEM14 + ITEM16 + ITEM20
  DEP =~ ITEM5 + ITEM10 + ITEM11 + ITEM15 + ITEM22
  ACC =~ ITEM4 + ITEM7 + ITEM9 + ITEM12 + ITEM17 + ITEM18 + ITEM19 + ITEM21

  # Covariances between latent variables.
  EMO ~~ DEP
  DEP ~~ ACC
  EMO ~~ ACC
"

# Model syntax model 2.
model_2 <- "
  # Measurement part.
  EMO =~ ITEM1 + ITEM2 + ITEM3 + ITEM6 + ITEM8 + ITEM13 + ITEM14 + ITEM16 + ITEM20
  DEP =~ ITEM5 + ITEM10 + ITEM11 + ITEM15 + ITEM22
  ACC =~ ITEM4 + ITEM7 + ITEM9 + ITEM12 + ITEM17 + ITEM18 + ITEM19 + ITEM21

  # Covariances between latent variables.
  EMO ~~ DEP
  DEP ~~ ACC
  EMO ~ -ACC

  # Covariances between error terms.
  ITEM6 ~~ ITEM16
"

# Model fit model 1.
model_1_fit <- cfa(model_1, data = data, estimator = "ML")

# Model fit model 2.
model_2_fit <- cfa(model_2, data = data, estimator = "ML")
```

```
# Print first 3 modification indices for `model_1_fit`.
modificationIndices(model_1_fit, sort. = TRUE)[1:3, ]
```

```
##      lhs op   rhs    mi    epc sepc.lv sepc.all sepc.nox
## 158 ITEM6 ~~ ITEM16 91.282  0.733  0.733   0.529   0.529
##  95 ITEM1 ~~ ITEM2 82.448  0.613  0.613   0.549   0.549
##  59   EMO == ITEM12 41.517 -0.313 -0.400  -0.335  -0.335
```

We expect the reduction in χ^2 for `model_2` to be roughly 91.282, based on the inclusion of parameter `ITEM6` `~~` `ITEM16`. We see that this is indeed the case if we subtract the χ^2 values for `model_1_fit` and `model_2_fit`:

$$\chi^2_{\text{model 1}} - \chi^2_{\text{model 2}} = 695.719 - 597.731 = 97.988$$

Now, if we perform a LRT we expect to see the same difference since this time we used the default ML estimator.

```
# Likelihood Ratio Test.
lavTestLRT(model_1_fit, model_2_fit)
```

```
## Chi-Squared Difference Test
##
##           Df   AIC   BIC  Chisq Chisq diff Df diff Pr(>Chisq)
## model_2_fit 205 25620 25808 597.73
## model_1_fit 206 25716 25900 695.72    97.988      1 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Again, we see a χ^2 difference of 97.988.