

Example with Categorical Indicators

Mplus

WLSMV (Robust DWLS Approach) with Theta Parameterization

(note: results generated with Mplus 8.9)

INPUT INSTRUCTIONS

```
title: CESD second order model with categorical designation;

data: file=c:\jason\mplus\negex\wave1\pncesdw1.dat;
      format=35f1.0;
      listwise=on;

variable: names = wladv1 wladv2 wladv3 wlhlp1 wlhlp2
                 wlhlp3 wlvst1 wlvst2 wlvst3 wlemo1
                 wlemo2 wlemo3 wlunw1 wlunw2 wlunw3
                 wldwn1 wldwn2 wldwn3 wlout1 wlout2
                 wlout3 wlfai1 wlfai2 wlfai3 wldbth
                 wldblues wldmind wlddep wldefrt wldsleee
                 wldhappy wldlone wldnogo wldsad wldenjoy;

      usevariable= wldbth wldblues wldmind wlddep wldefrt
                 wldsleee wldhappy wldsad wldenjoy;

      categorical=wldbth wldblues wldmind wlddep wldefrt
                 wldsleee wldhappy wldsad wldenjoy;

analysis: type=general; estimator=wlsmv; parameterization=theta;
          !WLSMV is the default and estimator= is not needed here;
          !parameterization=theta changes the default delta parameterization to theta;
          !WLSMV gives probit estimates;

model: negaff by wldbth wldblues wlddep wldsad;
       somatic by wldmind wldefrt wldsleee;
       positive by wldhappy wldenjoy;

output: stdyx;
```

INPUT READING TERMINATED NORMALLY

CESD second order model with categorical designation;

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

Number of groups	1
Number of observations	720
Number of dependent variables	9
Number of independent variables	0
Number of continuous latent variables	3

Observed dependent variables

Binary and ordered categorical (ordinal)					
W1DBOTH	W1DBLUES	W1DMIND	W1DDEP	W1DEFRT	W1DSLEEE
W1DHAPPY	W1DSAD	W1DENJOY			

Continuous latent variables

NEGAFF	SOMATIC	POSITIVE
--------	---------	----------

Estimator	WLSMV
Maximum number of iterations	1000
Convergence criterion	0.500D-04
Maximum number of steepest descent iterations	20
Parameterization	THETA
Link	PROBIT

MODEL FIT INFORMATION

Number of Free Parameters 39

Chi-Square Test of Model Fit

Value	39.254*
Degrees of Freedom	24
P-Value	0.0257

* The chi-square value for MLM, MLMV, MLR, ULSMV, WLSM and WLSMV cannot be used for chi-square difference testing in the regular way. MLM, MLR and WLSM chi-square difference testing is described on the Mplus website. MLMV, WLSMV, and ULSMV difference testing is done using the DIFFTEST option.

RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error Of Approximation)

Estimate	0.030
90 Percent C.I.	0.010 0.046
Probability RMSEA <= .05	0.982

CFI/TLI

CFI	0.997
TLI	0.995

Chi-Square Test of Model Fit for the Baseline Model

Value	4645.035
Degrees of Freedom	36
P-Value	0.0000

SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual)

Value	0.023
-------	-------

Optimum Function Value for Weighted Least-Squares Estimator

Value	0.12781725D-01
-------	----------------

MODEL RESULTS

	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
NEGAFF BY				
W1DBOTH	1.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
W1DBLUES	2.327	0.290	8.018	0.000
W1DDEP	3.097	0.382	8.104	0.000
W1DSAD	2.775	0.328	8.473	0.000
SOMATIC BY				
W1DMIND	1.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
W1DEFRT	1.521	0.219	6.937	0.000
W1DSLEEP	0.758	0.108	7.026	0.000
POSITIVE BY				
W1DHAPPY	1.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
W1DENJOY	0.804	0.181	4.430	0.000
SOMATIC WITH				
NEGAFF	0.444	0.066	6.710	0.000
POSITIVE WITH				
NEGAFF	0.980	0.176	5.567	0.000
SOMATIC	0.896	0.174	5.144	0.000
Variances				
NEGAFF	0.461	0.088	5.259	0.000
SOMATIC	0.665	0.128	5.190	0.000
POSITIVE	3.852	1.142	3.373	0.001

STANDARDIZED MODEL RESULTS

STDYX Standardization

	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
NEGAFB BY				
W1DBOTH	0.562	0.037	15.365	0.000
W1DBLUES	0.845	0.023	36.571	0.000
W1DDEP	0.903	0.015	61.117	0.000
W1DSAD	0.883	0.015	58.328	0.000
SOMATIC BY				
W1DMIND	0.632	0.037	17.288	0.000
W1DEFRT	0.779	0.032	24.155	0.000
W1DSLEEP	0.526	0.041	12.673	0.000
POSITIVE BY				
W1DHAPPY	0.891	0.027	32.725	0.000
W1DENJOY	0.845	0.028	30.113	0.000
SOMATIC WITH NEGAFB	0.802	0.031	25.520	0.000
POSITIVE WITH NEGAFB SOMATIC	0.736 0.560	0.029 0.048	25.538 11.590	0.000 0.000

R-SQUARE

Observed Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value	Scale Factors
W1DBOTH	0.315	0.041	7.682	0.000	0.827
W1DBLUES	0.714	0.039	18.285	0.000	0.535
W1DMIND	0.400	0.046	8.644	0.000	0.775
W1DDEP	0.815	0.027	30.559	0.000	0.430
W1DEFRT	0.606	0.050	12.078	0.000	0.628
W1DSLEEP	0.277	0.044	6.337	0.000	0.851
W1DHAPPY	0.794	0.049	16.363	0.000	0.454
W1DSAD	0.780	0.027	29.164	0.000	0.469
W1DENJOY	0.713	0.047	15.057	0.000	0.535

lavaan

WLSMV (Robust DWLS Approach) with Theta Parameterization

```
> ## categorical data analysis with lavaan
>
> #because the data were fixed format, special statements are needed
> pncesdw1= read.fortran("c:/jason/plus/negex/wave1/pncesdw1.dat",
+   c("F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0",
+     "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0",
+     "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0",
+     "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0",
+     "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0",
+     "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0", "F1.0"))
> names(pncesdw1) = c("w1adv1", "w1adv2", "w1adv3", "w1hlp1", "w1hlp2",
+   "w1hlp3", "w1vst1", "w1vst2", "w1vst3", "w1emo1",
+   "w1emo2", "w1emo3", "w1unw1", "w1unw2", "w1unw3",
+   "w1dwn1", "w1dwn2", "w1dwn3", "w1out1", "w1out2",
+   "w1out3", "w1fai1", "w1fai2", "w1fai3", "w1dboth",
+   "w1dblues", "w1dmind", "w1ddep", "w1defrt", "w1dsleep",
+   "w1dhappy", "w1dnone", "w1dnogo", "w1dsad", "w1denjoy")
>
>
> twofact = '
+   negaff =~ w1dboth + w1dblues + w1ddep + w1dsad
+   somatic =~ w1dmind + w1defrt + w1dsleep
+   positive =~ w1dhappy + w1denjoy
+ ,
>
> model1= sem(twofact, data = pncesdw1, missing = 'listwise', ordered=c("w1dboth",
+   "w1dblues", "w1dmind", "w1ddep", "w1defrt", "w1dsleep",
+   "w1dhappy", "w1dnone", "w1dnogo", "w1dsad", "w1denjoy"), estimator="wlsmv",
+   parameterization="theta")
> summary(model1, fit.measures=TRUE, rsquare=TRUE, standardized=TRUE)
```

(excerpts)

Lavaan 0.6-18 ended normally after 86 iterations

Estimator	DWLS
Optimization method	NLMINB
Number of model parameters	39
Number of observations	720

Model Test User Model:	Standard	Scaled
Test Statistic	18.380	39.203
Degrees of freedom	24	24
P-value (Chi-square)	0.784	0.026
Scaling correction factor		0.503
Shift parameter		2.646
simple second-order correction		

Model Test Baseline Model:		
Test statistic	8225.833	4638.605
Degrees of freedom	36	36
P-value	0.000	0.000
Scaling correction factor		1.779

User Model versus Baseline Model:		
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	1.000	0.997
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	1.001	0.995
Robust Comparative Fit Index (CFI)		0.986
Robust Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)		0.980

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation:		
RMSEA	0.000	0.030
90 Percent confidence interval - lower	0.000	0.010
90 Percent confidence interval - upper	0.021	0.046
P-value H ₀ : RMSEA ≤ 0.050	1.000	0.982
P-value H ₀ : RMSEA ≥ 0.080	0.000	0.000
Robust RMSEA		0.053
90 Percent confidence interval - lower		0.025
90 Percent confidence interval - upper		0.078
P-value H ₀ : Robust RMSEA ≤ 0.050		0.402
P-value H ₀ : Robust RMSEA ≥ 0.080		0.038

Standardized Root Mean Square Residual:		
SRMR	0.029	0.029

Parameter Estimates:		
Parameterization	Theta	
Standard errors	Robust.sem	
Information	Expected	
Information saturated (h1) model	Unstructured	

Latent Variables:	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(> z)	Std.lv	Std.all
negaff =~						
w1dboth	1.000				0.679	0.562
w1dblues	2.327	0.290	8.012	0.000	1.579	0.845
w1ddep	3.097	0.382	8.099	0.000	2.102	0.903
w1dsad	2.776	0.328	8.467	0.000	1.884	0.883
somatic =~						
w1dmind	1.000				0.816	0.632
w1defrt	1.520	0.219	6.933	0.000	1.240	0.779
w1dsleep	0.758	0.108	7.021	0.000	0.618	0.526
positive =~						
w1dhappy	1.000				1.962	0.891
w1denjoy	0.804	0.182	4.428	0.000	1.577	0.845

Covariances:	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(> z)	Std.lv	Std.all
negaff ~~						
somatic	0.444	0.066	6.706	0.000	0.802	0.802
positive	0.980	0.176	5.564	0.000	0.736	0.736
somatic ~~						
positive	0.896	0.174	5.141	0.000	0.560	0.560

Thresholds:	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(> z)	Std.lv	Std.all
w1dboth t1	0.190	0.057	3.316	0.001	0.190	0.157
w1dboth t2	1.432	0.079	18.133	0.000	1.432	1.185
w1dboth t3	2.132	0.110	19.454	0.000	2.132	1.764

w1dblues t1	1.352	0.138	9.801	0.000	1.352	0.723
w1dblues t2	2.456	0.185	13.291	0.000	2.456	1.314
w1dblues t3	3.100	0.215	14.420	0.000	3.100	1.658
w1ddep t1	0.888	0.139	6.376	0.000	0.888	0.382
w1ddep t2	2.928	0.237	12.341	0.000	2.928	1.258
w1ddep t3	3.860	0.292	13.210	0.000	3.860	1.658
w1dsad t1	0.533	0.111	4.779	0.000	0.533	0.250
w1dsad t2	2.542	0.181	14.041	0.000	2.542	1.192
w1dsad t3	3.508	0.215	16.345	0.000	3.508	1.645
w1dmind t1	0.281	0.063	4.489	0.000	0.281	0.218
w1dmind t2	1.409	0.086	16.467	0.000	1.409	1.092
w1dmind t3	2.140	0.118	18.115	0.000	2.140	1.658
w1defrt t1	0.100	0.075	1.325	0.185	0.100	0.063
w1defrt t2	1.413	0.120	11.755	0.000	1.413	0.887
w1defrt t3	1.957	0.144	13.550	0.000	1.957	1.228
w1dsleep t1	0.049	0.055	0.892	0.372	0.049	0.042
w1dsleep t2	0.659	0.061	10.824	0.000	0.659	0.561
w1dsleep t3	1.164	0.071	16.503	0.000	1.164	0.990
w1dhappy t1	1.226	0.184	6.670	0.000	1.226	0.557
w1dhappy t2	2.672	0.327	8.172	0.000	2.672	1.213
w1dhappy t3	4.170	0.441	9.460	0.000	4.170	1.893
w1denjoy t1	1.472	0.159	9.285	0.000	1.472	0.788
w1denjoy t2	2.364	0.212	11.141	0.000	2.364	1.266
w1denjoy t3	3.536	0.268	13.174	0.000	3.536	1.893

Mplus

MLR—Robust Marginal Maximum Likelihood with Categorical Variables

Although unlikely to be of interest here for loadings, the path coefficients obtained with categorical ML estimation can be converted to odds ratios, using e^β , where e is the mathematical constant (approximately 2.72) and β is the unstandardized structural path coefficient. The robust adjustments (`estimator=MLR`) appear to do better than nonrobust marginal maximum likelihood (`estimator=ML`; Bandalos, 2014).

Because, I used the same model statements as above, I omitted them to save space. The analysis statements were changed to these, however .

```
analysis: type=general; estimator=mlr;
!estimator=mlr invokes full maximum likelihood with robust adjustments
! when categorical variables are identified. Estimates are logit with this
! method and odds ratios can be used with predictive paths;
```

(output excerpts)

```
Estimator                               MLR
Information matrix                       OBSERVED
Optimization Specifications for the Quasi-Newton Algorithm for
Integration Specifications
Type                                     STANDARD
Number of integration points             15
Dimensions of numerical integration       3
Adaptive quadrature                      ON
Link                                     LOGIT
Cholesky                                  ON
```

THE MODEL ESTIMATION TERMINATED NORMALLY

MODEL FIT INFORMATION

Number of Free Parameters 39

Loglikelihood

```
H0 Value -5396.880
H0 Scaling Correction Factor 1.0506
for MLR
```

Information Criteria

```
Akaike (AIC) 10871.759
Bayesian (BIC) 11050.350
Sample-Size Adjusted BIC 10926.514
(n* = (n + 2) / 24)
```

Chi-Square Test of Model Fit for the Binary and Ordered Categorical
 (Ordinal) Outcomes**

Pearson Chi-Square	
Value	6871.310
Degrees of Freedom	261972
P-Value	1.0000
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	
Value	1464.685
Degrees of Freedom	261972
P-Value	1.0000

** Of the 262144 cells in the frequency table, 132
 were deleted in the calculation of chi-square due to extreme values.

MODEL RESULTS

	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
NEGAFB BY				
W1DBOTH	1.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
W1DBLUES	2.191	0.300	7.296	0.000
W1DDEP	3.184	0.486	6.548	0.000
W1DSAD	2.730	0.382	7.152	0.000
SOMATIC BY				
W1DMIND	1.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
W1DEFRT	1.420	0.210	6.779	0.000
W1DSLEEP	0.714	0.115	6.236	0.000
POSITIVE BY				
W1DHAPPY	1.000	0.000	999.000	999.000
W1DENJOY	0.939	0.208	4.502	0.000
SOMATIC WITH				
NEGAFB	1.438	0.234	6.149	0.000
POSITIVE WITH				
NEGAFB	2.895	0.555	5.218	0.000
SOMATIC	2.613	0.559	4.675	0.000
Thresholds				
W1DBOTH\$1	0.319	0.097	3.300	0.001
W1DBOTH\$2	2.486	0.153	16.287	0.000
W1DBOTH\$3	3.852	0.234	16.461	0.000
W1DBLUES\$1	2.226	0.229	9.738	0.000
W1DBLUES\$2	4.173	0.339	12.311	0.000
W1DBLUES\$3	5.429	0.442	12.273	0.000
W1DMIND\$1	0.487	0.108	4.499	0.000
W1DMIND\$2	2.449	0.169	14.464	0.000
W1DMIND\$3	3.826	0.235	16.305	0.000
W1DDEP\$1	1.548	0.245	6.332	0.000
W1DDEP\$2	5.232	0.517	10.125	0.000
W1DDEP\$3	7.243	0.665	10.887	0.000
W1DEFRT\$1	0.176	0.126	1.400	0.162
W1DEFRT\$2	2.427	0.220	11.010	0.000
W1DEFRT\$3	3.376	0.282	11.973	0.000
W1DSLEEP\$1	0.084	0.091	0.928	0.353
W1DSLEEP\$2	1.095	0.105	10.414	0.000
W1DSLEEP\$3	1.965	0.128	15.354	0.000
W1DHAPPY\$1	2.114	0.319	6.634	0.000
W1DHAPPY\$2	4.681	0.596	7.854	0.000
W1DHAPPY\$3	7.086	0.935	7.581	0.000
W1DSAD\$1	0.897	0.187	4.787	0.000
W1DSAD\$2	4.427	0.373	11.853	0.000
W1DSAD\$3	6.390	0.501	12.744	0.000
W1DENJOY\$1	2.842	0.361	7.880	0.000
W1DENJOY\$2	4.590	0.529	8.676	0.000
W1DENJOY\$3	6.740	0.793	8.498	0.000
Variances				
NEGAFB	1.485	0.311	4.769	0.000
SOMATIC	2.149	0.475	4.524	0.000
POSITIVE	10.737	3.305	3.249	0.001

STANDARDIZED MODEL RESULTS

STDYX Standardization

	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
NEGAFB BY				
W1DBOTH	0.558	0.040	13.842	0.000
W1DBLUES	0.827	0.028	29.557	0.000
W1DDEP	0.906	0.018	50.302	0.000
W1DSAD	0.878	0.019	45.509	0.000
SOMATIC BY				
W1DMIND	0.629	0.042	14.958	0.000
W1DEFRT	0.754	0.038	20.055	0.000
W1DSLEEP	0.500	0.044	11.371	0.000
POSITIVE BY				
W1DHAPPY	0.875	0.032	27.708	0.000
W1DENJOY	0.861	0.031	27.379	0.000
SOMATIC WITH NEGAFB	0.805	0.037	22.018	0.000
POSITIVE WITH NEGAFB	0.725	0.042	17.440	0.000
SOMATIC	0.544	0.061	8.947	0.000

R-SQUARE

Observed Variable	Estimate	S.E.	Est./S.E.	Two-Tailed P-Value
W1DBOTH	0.311	0.045	6.921	0.000
W1DBLUES	0.684	0.046	14.779	0.000
W1DMIND	0.395	0.053	7.479	0.000
W1DDEP	0.821	0.033	25.151	0.000
W1DEFRT	0.569	0.057	10.027	0.000
W1DSLEEP	0.250	0.044	5.686	0.000
W1DHAPPY	0.765	0.055	13.854	0.000
W1DSAD	0.771	0.034	22.755	0.000
W1DENJOY	0.742	0.054	13.690	0.000

lavaan

Marginal maximum likelihood estimation for binary and ordered categorical variables is not presently supported by lavaan except for some confirmatory factor models. Keep your eye on this page, <http://lavaan.ugent.be/tutorial/cat.html>, because maximum likelihood for categorical estimators may be added in the near future.

References

Bandalos, D. L. (2014). Relative performance of categorical diagonally weighted least squares and robust maximum likelihood estimation. *Structural Equation Modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, 21, 102-116.