Model Averaging

Quoting from Cooch & White (Chapter 4), "... 'model selection should be considered as the process of making inference from a set of models, not just a search for a single best model'. As such, whenever possible, use model averaging. Not only does this account for model selection uncertainty regarding estimated parameters and weight of evidence for each approximating model ..."

For now, we'll focus on the estimates of weekly survival for black ducks from 4 competing models from Lab 1. Each model provides slightly different estimates of weekly survival. And, each model receives a different amount of support from the data.

Model	AICc	Delta AICc	AICc Weight	Model Likelihood	No. Par.	Deviance
{S(Temp)}	136.6898	0.0000	0.87172	1.0000	2	0.6383
{S(.)}	141.4861	4.7963	0.07923	0.0909	1	7.4630
{S(T)}	142.5427	5.8529	0.04671	0.0536	2	6.4911
{s(t)}	148.5325	11.8427	0.00234	0.0027	8	0.0000

Program MARK has good tools for model-averaging. For the real parameters (i.e., weekly survival estimates [rather than the beta's or the log-odds of S]), we can easily get model-averaged estimates back for this week's problem. (*It will get more complicated when individual covariates are in play; more on that later.*)

🥹 Program MARK Interface - duck survival - no individual covariates (C:\Users\f58f484\Documents\Teaching\pop analys																	
File	Delete	Order	Output	Retrie	eve PI	M De	sign	Run	Simula	ations	Tests	Adji	ustments	Window	Help		
	2	?	Specif Table	fic Mod of Mod	lel Outpu del Resu	ut ► ilts ►											
1	Results	Browse	Apper	nd													
â	E]≡	Apper	nd Sub	director	у		& /	ب الم	• A	8	٦l					
	Mod	el	Model	Avera	aging	•	Re	al	_1	Model	Likeliho	od	No. Par.	Deviar	ice	 	
{S(1	[emp)}		Input Input	Data S Data F	Summary File Listin	y ng '	De	erived	.0/1/2		1.00	000	2	0.	6383		
{S(.))}		File No	otes				0	.07923		0.09	009	1	7.	4630		
{S(1	ŋ)}	,	142	.5427	Ę	5.8529	-	0	.04671		0.05	536	2	6.	4911		
{s(t)	}		148	.5325	11	1.8427		0	.00234		0.00	27	8	0.	0000		

III Model Averaging Parameter Selection									
Survival Parameter (S) Group 1									
V 1 V 2 V 3 V 4 V 5 V 6 V 7 V	8								
Sel. Top Row Sel. 1st Diag. Select All									
Select 1 or more parameters from the Tab Windows, and click OK to proceed.									
Print Variance-Covariance Matrix	Revised model-averaging variance formulas								
Export Variance-Covariance Matrix to a dBase file	Estimates into an Excel Spreadsheet								
Only select models for the current data type	Help Cancel OK								

Set the model-averaging parameter selection window up as below and click 'OK'.

The Excel sheet provides the model-averaged estimates, which are as shown below.

	A	В	С	D	E	
1	Parameter	Estimate	SE	LCI	UCI	
2	Survival Parameter (S)	0.969698	0.018008	0.905898	0.990687	
3	Survival Parameter (S)	0.954539	0.016022	0.910576	0.977425	
4	Survival Parameter (S)	0.943684	0.015169	0.905456	0.967017	
5	Survival Parameter (S)	0.867199	0.048356	0.741434	0.936991	
6	Survival Parameter (S)	0.912869	0.021126	0.861594	0.946331	
7	Survival Parameter (S)	0.891892	0.031402	0.813345	0.93983	
8	Survival Parameter (S)	0.961316	0.020635	0.893336	0.986619	
9	Survival Parameter (S)	0.952571	0.020704	0.89107	0.980124	
10						

But, we want to look at the mechanics of how the model-averaged point estimates were obtained from the model-selection table and the model-specific weekly estimates.

Estimates for week 1

duck survival - no individual covariates								
Estimates only for data type Known Fate								
Survival Parameter (S)	Group 1 1	Parameter 1						
Model	Weight	Estimate	Standard Error					
{S(Temp)}	0.87172	0.9740110	0.0130349					
{S(.)}	0.07923	0.9330986	0.0148259					
{S(T)}	0.04671	0.9508169	0.0199414					
{s(t)}	0.00234	0.9791667	0.0206152					
Weighted Average		0.9696982	0.0135171					
Unconditional SE 0.0180084								
95% CI for Wgt. Ave. Est. (logit trans.) is 0.9058982 to 0.9906872								
Percent of Variation Attributable to Model Variation is 43.66%								

The table provided by Program MARK orders the estimates by model weight (which correspond with what's in the model-selection table). The weights for all models sum to 1.0. Thus, we can simply (1) multiply each model's survival estimate by the corresponding AICc weight for the model and (2) sum the resulting values across all models. That is,

$$\operatorname{avg}(\hat{\theta}) = \hat{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^{R} w_i \hat{\theta}_i$$

For week 1, 0.9696982 = 0.872*0.974 + 0.079*0.933 + 0.047*0.951 + 0.002*0.979

This procedure is repeated for each of the weeks. With this procedure, you don't have to make arbitrary decisions about which models to consider; all are allowed to influence the model-averaged estimate in accordance with the amount of support they received.

The uncertainty in the model-averaged estimate is influenced by model-selection uncertainty, variation in the model-specific estimates, and the SEs associated with each model's estimate. If different well-supported models produce different estimates from one another, then the uncertainty on the model-averaged estimate will be larger than if all the well-supported models provide very similar estimates. You can find details about how the unconditional SE is obtained in Cooch & White (Chapter 4).