

Structural equation models

Montana Chapter of The Wildlife Society

4 March 2024




FIGURE 2 A directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (ξ), hunting mortality hazard rate (h_κ), natural mortality hazard rate (h_η), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (H ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–3016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Facilitators!



Colton Padilla



Kaitlyn Vega



Sunny Domschot




Liv Lundin

Hi!

Thomas Riecke

Assistant Professor

James K. Ringelman Chair in Waterfowl Conservation



thomas.riecke@umontana.edu

What is structural equation modeling, and why is it useful?

Time	Topic
	Theory (mostly talking, little bit of doing)
0900-0945	Why are we doing this?
1000-1045	Linear models to path analysis
1100-1145	Latent variables
	Application (mostly doing, little bit of talking)
1300-1345	piecewiseSEM (and brms)
1400-1445	lavaan (and blavaan)
1500-	Moving beyond packages and questions(!)

Quick notes and ‘tone’


- This is ‘take one’ for a one-day workshop!
 - Currently it’s a semester-long Bayesian SEM course.
 - It will eventually be a one-week Bayes/SEM workshop, and maybe a book.
- Feedback is very welcome!
- There are no ‘bad’ questions!

Learning outcomes or goals

- Direct you towards useful reading and learning opportunities.
- Demonstrate why these techniques are useful and important!
- Put you in the ‘driver’s seat’ for some basic and perhaps not-so-basic analyses


Why are we doing this?

Ecological systems are complex networks (e.g., food webs)




Your elementary school biology textbook (probably)


Ecological systems are complex networks (e.g., food webs)




Ecological systems are unbelievably complex networks...




**Climate
network**
Abiotic systems




**Food
Network**
Among populations



**Social
Network**
Within populations




**Gene
Network**
Within individuals





**Microbial
Network**
Within individuals

'Ecological reality' is a complex product of abiotic conditions, community, population & social dynamics, genetics, & microbial communities




'Reality'

Ecological reality is beyond our comprehension



Ecological reality is beyond our comprehension (ECOL/EVST 101)



We're taught this over and over again (e.g., Operation Cat Drop)



We're taught this over and over again (e.g., Operation Cat Drop)

Parachuting Cats into Borneo – A Cautionary Tale

In the early 1950's, the Dayak people of Borneo suffered a malarial outbreak. The World Health Organisation (WHO) had a solution: to spray large amounts of DDT to kill the mosquitoes that carried the malaria. The mosquitoes died; the malaria declined; so far so good. But there were unexpected side effects. Amongst the first was that the roofs of the people's houses began to fall down on their heads. It seemed that the DDT had also killed a parasitic wasp which had previously controlled thatch-eating caterpillars. Worse, the DDT-poisoned insects were eaten by geckoes, which were eaten by cats. The cats started to die, the rats flourished, and the people were threatened by outbreaks of typhus and plague. To cope with these problems, which it had itself created, the WHO was obliged to parachute 14 000 live cats into Borneo. Operation Cat Drop, now almost forgotten at the WHO, is a graphic illustration of the interconnectedness of life, and of the fact that the root of problems often stems from their purported solutions.

(Quoted in Rachel Wynberg and Christine Jardine, *Biotechnology and Biodiversity: Key Policy Issues for South Africa*, 2000)

DDT




No more malaria

We're taught this over and over again (e.g., Operation Cat Drop)

Parachuting Cats into Borneo – A Cautionary Tale

In the early 1950's, the Dayak people of Borneo suffered a malarial outbreak. The World Health Organisation (WHO) had a solution: to spray large amounts of DDT to kill the mosquitoes that carried the malaria. The mosquitoes died; the malaria declined; so far so good. But there were unexpected side effects. Amongst the first was that the roofs of the people's houses began to fall down on their heads. It seemed that the DDT had also killed a parasitic wasp which had previously controlled thatch-eating caterpillars. Worse, the DDT-poisoned insects were eaten by geckoes, which were eaten by cats. The cats started to die, the rats flourished, and the people were threatened by outbreaks of typhus and plague. To cope with these problems, which it had itself created, the WHO was obliged to parachute 14 000 live cats into Borneo. Operation Cat Drop, now almost forgotten at the WHO, is a graphic illustration of the interconnectedness of life, and of the fact that the root of problems often stems from their purported solutions.

(Quoted in Rachel Wynberg and Christine Jardine, *Biotechnology and Biodiversity: Key Policy Issues for South Africa*, 2000)




No more malaria, but roofs collapsing

We're taught this over and over again (e.g., Operation Cat Drop)

Parachuting Cats into Borneo – A Cautionary Tale


In the early 1950's, the Dayak people of Borneo suffered a malarial outbreak. The World Health Organisation (WHO) had a solution: to spray large amounts of DDT to kill the mosquitoes that carried the malaria. The mosquitoes died; the malaria declined; so far so good. But there were unexpected side effects. Amongst the first was that the roofs of the people's houses began to fall down on their heads. It seemed that the DDT had also killed a parasitic wasp which had previously controlled thatch-eating caterpillars. Worse, the DDT-poisoned insects were eaten by geckoes, which were eaten by cats. The cats started to die, the rats flourished, and the people were threatened by outbreaks of typhus and plague. To cope with these problems, which it had itself created, the WHO was obliged to parachute 14 000 live cats into Borneo. Operation Cat Drop, now almost forgotten at the WHO, is a graphic illustration of the interconnectedness of life, and of the fact that the root of problems often stems from their purported solutions.

(Quoted in Rachel Wynberg and Christine Jardine, *Biotechnology and Biodiversity: Key Policy Issues for South Africa*, 2000)





No more malaria, but roofs collapsing, plague and typhus spreading

We're taught this over and over again (e.g., Operation Cat Drop)





No more malaria, but roofs collapsing, plague and typhus spreading, so RAF air-dropped 14k cats

Complexity strikes again!




Science responds to this complexity with experiments




Experiments are often beautiful!

We can't always do experiments (for myriad reasons)



Similar problems in other fields (e.g., epidemiology, social sciences)

We can never do experiments in the past!





Similar problems in other fields (e.g., epidemiology, social sciences)



Darn it!

So what do we do?!



GLMs dominate observational ecological analyses



GLMs focus on a single response as a function of covariates





GLMs focus on a single response (i.e., dependent variable)...





as a function of covariates (i.e., independent variables)



This is insufficient!



Covariates are often connected, or collinear (**NOT** ‘independent’)




Multicollinearity is a major ‘problem’ in ecological analysis



How many of you have had to exclude collinear ($r > 0.7$) covariates?

Why did you do that?





How did you exclude covariates?

How did you exclude covariates?

- *a priori*
- test which fit ‘best’ (i.e., ‘iterative’ model selection?)
- haphazardly?
- $r = 0.694\dots$ it’s fine!



How many of you felt ‘good’ about throwing away data?

So... what do we do?





Why were they collinear?

Why were they collinear? The motivating problem!



All models are wrong, but some are useful – GC Box




No models are right, and most are useless – TW Arnold

Why were they collinear?

- 1) ‘random’ or ‘spurious’?
- 2) **One covariate affects another**
 - e.g., elevation and snow or forest cover
- 3) **Both covariates are a result of an underlying latent process**
 - e.g., multiple morphometric measurements

The key idea for this workshop...



Can we model that* instead of pleading ‘multicollinearity’?


**No. Not in its entirety, reality is far too complicated for us to begin to comprehend*

We can do better...

**The ‘intellectual leap’ is to be able to think about
more than one response variable at a time**


**i.e., more than one variable will ‘depend’ on other
variables...**

GLM problem




Fish and fishing are collinear because they affect each other

'Path analysis' solution




We can explicitly model those relationships

'Path analysis' solution












We can explicitly model those relationships

We can't do this! Unless...



We can explicitly model those relationships



$t = 1$



$t = 2$


+

$t = 1$



Dynamic SEMs


Cross-lags



$t = 2$


+

GLM problem




These are all measurement of different aspects of 'size'

Latent variable solution




These are all measurement of different aspects of 'size'

GLM problem





Flow rate, precipitation, and temperature as measurements of drought

Latent variable solution





Flow rate, precipitation, and temperature as measurements of drought

All models are wrong, but some are useful – GC Box



No models are right, and most are useless – TW Arnold

This model is a little less wrong, and potentially more useful?



No models are right, and most are useless – TW Arnold

I've begun to use these approaches in my own research

Example(s): applied population dynamics (e.g., CMR, IPMs)




FIGURE 1 Simplified path diagram describing the hypothesized directionality (plus: Positive, bar: Negative association) regarding how environmental variables (i.e., sea-surface temperatures in the North Atlantic, fishery pressure, and fish production) influenced one another, as well as the indirect and direct pathways in which these sources of environmental variability influenced Royal tern mortality.

Received: 28 June 2022 | Revised: 26 September 2022 | Accepted: 5 October 2022

DOI: 10.1111/gcb.16482

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Global Change Biology WILEY

Climate change and commercial fishing practices codetermine survival of a long-lived seabird

Daniel Gibson^{1,2} | Thomas V. Riecke³ | Daniel H. Catlin² | Kelsi L. Hunt² | Chelsea E. Weithman² | David N. Koons⁴ | Sarah M. Karpany² | James D. Fraser²



Received: 2 November 2021 | Accepted: 10 August 2022
DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.13807

RESEARCH ARTICLE




FIGURE 2 Directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (q ; brown), hunting mortality hazard rate (H), natural mortality hazard rate (η), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (K ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–2016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Density-dependence produces spurious relationships among demographic parameters in a harvested species

Thomas V. Riecke^{1,2,3} | Madeleine G. Lohman^{1,2} | Benjamin S. Sedinger^{1,2,4} | Todd W. Arnold⁵ | Cliff L. Feldheim⁶ | David N. Koons⁷ | Frank C. Rohwer⁸ | Michael Schaub³ | Perry J. Williams² | James S. Sedinger²

¹Graduate Program in Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation Biology, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA; ²Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA; ³Swiss Ornithological Institute, Sempach, Switzerland; ⁴University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, USA; ⁵Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA; ⁶California Trout, San Francisco, California, USA; ⁷Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology & Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado, USA and ⁸Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Bismarck, North Dakota, USA



Example: basic evolutionary demography (e.g., LRS, senescence)

Estimating latent heterogeneity in individual fitness using structural
equation models

Thomas V. Riecke^{1,2,3}, Rémi Fay⁴, Johann Hegelbach⁵, Pierre-Alain Ravussin⁶, Daniel Arrigo⁷ and Michael Schaub¹




Figure 1. Medians (solid lines) and 95% confidence intervals (dashed lines) for joint estimates of survival (ϕ) and mean recruits per breeding season (ξ) of one-year-old European pied flycatcher (left; *Ficedula hypoleuca*) and white-throated dipper (right; *Cinclus cinclus*) females breeding in Switzerland. The density of the shading corresponds to the density of the posterior distribution.

Riecke et al. (in rejection) *Ecology*

Received: 22 April 2022 | Accepted: 10 January 2023

DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.13893

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Journal of Animal Ecology
BRITISH
ECOLOGICAL
SOCIETY

Reproductive senescence and mating tactic interact and conflict to drive reproductive success in a passerine

Thomas V. Riecke¹ | Johann Hegelbach² | Michael Schaub¹




FIGURE 5 | Image and contour plots of the means (μ ; top) and standard deviations (σ ; bottom) of the predicted number of locally recruited offspring from monogamous (left) and polygynous (right) breeding attempts by known-age dipper pairs breeding along the River Sihl near Zurich, Switzerland (1989–2018).

Riecke et al. (2023) *Journal of Animal Ecology*

These tools have transformed how I do research.

I still have a tremendous amount to learn* (it's been three years)!

*I also use them almost exclusively in JAGS and Stan, so we're on thin ice today!

Ok





Two (patently ridiculous) motivating examples

Understanding applied waterfowl management outcomes

Silly [but critically important] example 1


How many ducks will we shoot if we do ‘X’?

Northern pintails are relatively unique among dabbling ducks





Like other ducks, they like ponds, but haven't done as well...




A textbook example of an ‘ecological trap’




Harvest management has been ‘our’ main response...






We've reached an impasse... 40 years of no results




Let's build a better model...







$$\text{glm}(K \sim R + N)$$








Let's build a better model...








$$\text{glm}(K \sim R + N + H)$$








Let's build a better model...






Let's build a better model...








A better model...



Two models, wildly different conclusions...





It's too late to do an experiment



Silly [but critically important] example 2


What is the effect of hunting on survival?

How does this happen?




Every hunter killed hen means 2 more survive?!



Pintail populations have crashed






A textbook example of an ‘ecological trap’



Habitat changes led to declines





Declines led to restrictive regulations





Long-term ecosystem change (and potentially harvest to some degree?) drove populations down, restrictive regs followed

Habitat changes also affected survival!





Long-term ecosystem change increased natural mortality rates?

Univariate regression is insufficient





In the past, things were good (hi S and k). Now they aren't.



Complicated relationships obscure reality








We're missing the point



We don't have to 'hand-wave,' we can try to model this stuff







We often make inference and decisions using linear models



Reality is more complicated, and can kick us in the teeth

SEMs allow us to model in the same way that we think



“If we do this, then 2-3 things will change, and they’ll affect each other”

Before we break...

These models can get pretty complicated pretty quickly...



Received: 2 November 2021 | Accepted: 10 August 2022

DOI: 10.1111/1365-2656.13807

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Journal of Animal Ecology



Density-dependence produces spurious relationships among demographic parameters in a harvested species

Thomas V. Riecke^{1,2,3} | Madeleine G. Lohman^{1,2} | Benjamin S. Sedinger^{1,2,4} |
Todd W. Arnold⁵ | Cliff L. Feldheim⁶ | David N. Koons⁷ | Frank C. Rohwer⁸ |
Michael Schaub³ | Perry J. Williams² | James S. Sedinger²

¹Graduate Program in Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation Biology, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA; ²Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA; ³Swiss Ornithological Institute, Sempach, Switzerland; ⁴University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, USA; ⁵Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA; ⁶California Trout, San Francisco, California, USA; ⁷Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology & Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado, USA and ⁸Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Bismarck, North Dakota, USA



RIECKE ET AL.

Journal of Animal Ecology | 2265





FIGURE 2 A directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (ξ), hunting mortality hazard rate (h_η), natural mortality hazard rate (h_κ), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (H ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–2016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Lots of stuff gets pretty complicated pretty quickly...



RIECKE ET AL.

Journal of Animal Ecology | 2265





FIGURE 2 A directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (ξ), hunting mortality hazard rate (h_h), natural mortality hazard rate (h_η), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (H ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–3016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Lots of stuff gets pretty complicated pretty quickly...



RIECKE ET AL.

Journal of Animal Ecology | 2265





FIGURE 2 A directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (ξ), hunting mortality hazard rate (H), natural mortality hazard rate (h_η), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (H ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–3016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Rough/fine carpentry is at least as hard as statistics

Lots of stuff gets pretty complicated pretty quickly...



RIECKE ET AL.

Journal of Animal Ecology | 2265




FIGURE 2 A directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (ξ), hunting mortality hazard rate (H), natural mortality hazard rate (h_η), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (n ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–3016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Being a good mechanic is much harder than statistics!

Lots of stuff gets pretty complicated pretty quickly...





FIGURE 2. A directed acyclic graph demonstrating the relationships among abundance (n), ponds (p ; blue), fecundity (ξ), hunting mortality hazard rate (h_k), natural mortality hazard rate (h_η), survival (s) and the number of duck hunters (H ; brown) for blue-winged teal breeding in the North American Prairie Pothole Region across the annual cycle (1973–2016). Solid arrows represent estimated directional relationships, and dashed arrows represent processes leading to changes in population abundance.

Heck sports might be harder! All these things just take time to learn!

Next up, path analysis...