

Two-step estimation of latent trait models

Jouni Kuha¹ and Zsuzsa Bakk²

¹Department of Statistics, London School of Economics and Political Science, London,
UK. j.kuha@lse.ac.uk

²Department of Methodology and Statistics, Leiden University, Leiden,
The Netherlands. z.bakk@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

July 23, 2024

Abstract

We consider two-step estimation of latent variable models, in which just the measurement model is estimated in the first step and the measurement parameters are then fixed at their estimated values in the second step where the structural model is estimated. We show how this approach can be implemented for latent trait models (item response theory models) where the latent variables are continuous and their measurement indicators are categorical variables. The properties of two-step estimators are examined using simulation studies and applied examples. They perform well, and have attractive practical and conceptual properties compared to the alternative one-step and three-step approaches. These results are in line with previous findings for other families of latent variable models. This provides strong evidence that two-step estimation is a flexible and useful general method of estimation for different types of latent variable models.

Key words: Item response theory models; latent variable models; structural equation models; pseudo-maximum likelihood estimation

1 Introduction

Latent variable models have normally two main parts: a *measurement model* which describes how the latent variables that appear in the model are measured by observed indicators of them, and a *structural model* which describes the associations among the latent variables and any observed explanatory and response variables which are not treated as measurement indicators. For instance, in the illustrative example considered in Section 5 of this paper the structural model specifies how individuals' extrinsic and intrinsic work value orientations are associated with characteristics of the individuals, and the measurement model specifies how these value orientations are measured by a set of survey questions. Here, as in many applications, the structural model is the focus of substantive interest, but the measurement model also needs to be included and estimated in order for the structural model to be estimable.

Estimation of these elements can be organised in different ways. In joint or *one-step estimation*, both parts of the model are estimated together. When this is done by maximizing the joint likelihood, one-step estimates are the maximum likelihood (ML) estimates of the model parameters. In contrast, “stepwise” approaches divide the estimation into separate steps. The most familiar of them is *three-step estimation*. In its first step, the measurement model is estimated from a specification which omits all or most of the structural model. In the second step, this estimated measurement model is used to assign predicted values of the latent variables to the units of analysis, such as factor scores for continuous latent variables. In the third step, these scores are used in place of the latent variables to estimate the structural model. There are “naive” and “adjusted” versions of three-step estimation, depending on whether it attempts to account for the measurement error that results from using the predicted values.

The focus of this paper is on a different stepwise approach, *two-step estimation* of latent variable models. Its first step is estimation of the measurement model, as in the three-step method. In the second step, instead of being used to calculate explicit predictions of the latent variables, the parameters of the measurement model are simply fixed at their estimated values. In other words, the second step takes the same form as one-step estimation, except that all the measurement parameters are treated as known numbers rather than unknown estimands. Likelihood-based two-step estimation derives its justification and properties from the general theory of pseudo maximum likelihood estimation. Its large-sample properties are very similar to those of one-step ML estimation.

Two-step estimates avoid the measurement error bias of naive three-step estimates, and are typically comparable in performance but more generally usable and practically simpler than adjusted three-step estimates. Compared to one-step estimation, the two-step approach has in principle attractive practical and conceptual advantages. Because it is split into two steps, both of them will be computationally less demanding than the single step of one-step estimation. It is also easy to estimate the measurement and structural models using fully or partially different sets of data, which is useful in some applications. The conceptual advantage arises from an inherent difference in how the two methods use the available data. Because the one-step approach fits all parts of the model at once, the estimated measurement model is informed not only by the measurement indicators but also by observed covariates and responses in the structural model. This can cause what Burt (1973, 1976) terms “interpretational confounding”, a situation where the implied definition of a latent variable is partly determined by variables that should be conceptually separate from it. In other words, if we change the specification of the structural model, this also changes the estimated measurement model and hence in effect changes the definition of the latent variables that appear in the structural model. This circularity is avoided by the two-step approach because it estimates the measurement model only once and using only the measurement indicators.

Two-step estimation is a general idea, and one of the points that we want to make in this paper is that it can in principle be applied to any latent variable models. However, there may be differences in performance of the estimates, ease of implementation, or other points to consider when it is used for different broad classes of models. In the literature so far, two-step estimation has accordingly been described separately for different types of models. It was proposed for latent class analysis, that is for models where both the latent variables and their indicators are categorical, by Bandeen-Roche et al. (1997), Xue and Bandeen-Roche (2002) and Bakk and Kuha (2018), and has since been extended to further versions of them (e.g. multilevel latent class analysis in Di Mari et al. 2023). For structural equation models

(SEMs), where the latent variables and indicators are both continuous, the idea was introduced already by Burt (1973, 1976), but detailed exploration of it is much more recent. In particular, Rosseel and Loh (2022) proposed a general two-step approach for SEMs, with the title of “structural-after-measurement” (SAM) estimation. They describe two (usually equivalent) forms of it: “local SAM” which summarises the first step in the form of the estimated means and covariance matrix of the variables in the structural model, and “global” SAM which is analogous to the implementation that we describe in this paper for latent trait models (the moment-based “local” approach is not really applicable to them). A method for SEMs is also proposed by Levy (2023), using Bayesian (MCMC) estimation for both steps. Another closely related paper is Skrondal and Kuha (2012), who use two-step estimation to correct for covariate measurement error in regression models. Two-step methods for these classes of models are now also being implemented in general-purpose software for latent variable modelling, in Latent Gold for latent class analysis (Vermunt and Magidson, 2021b) and in the R package *lavaan* for SAM (Rosseel, 2012; Rosseel and Loh, 2022).

In this paper we propose and examine two-step estimation for another family of latent variable models, one where the latent variables are continuous but their indicators are categorical. These are commonly known as *Item Response Theory (IRT) models*. We refer to them also as *latent trait models*. They resemble SEMs in having continuous latent variables, and standard latent class models in having categorical indicators. Like SEMs, they are often used with complex structural models which include multiple latent variables, whereas latent class analysis more often includes only one latent class variable. Computationally, latent trait models are typically the most demanding of these families of models, at least for ML estimation, because their log likelihood cannot be expressed in a closed form.

We describe the theory and implementation of two-step estimation of latent trait models. The presentation of this broadly parallels that of Bakk and Kuha (2018) for latent class models, but with the changes that are needed now that the latent variables are continuous. We then use simulation studies and an application example to explore the properties of the method in this context. The focus of comparisons is between two-step and one-step estimates, because generally applicable adjusted three-step estimates are not available for latent trait models. One question of interest is then whether the relative performance of the two-step method is similar to what it is for previously considered types of models. The conclusion is that it is, with some differences of emphasis (these findings are discussed in more detail in Sections 4–6). Two-step estimates of the structural model again perform very well. In complex models their computational advantage over one-step estimates is even larger than for latent class models and SEMs. On the other hand, interpretational confounding of one-step estimates may be less worrying here than for latent class models, because shifts in interpretation tend to be less abrupt for continuous latent variables than for categorical ones.

The latent trait model specifications that we consider are introduced in Section 2. The definition, implementation and properties of two-step estimation for them are described in Section 3. Simulation studies are reported in Section 4 and the real-data example in Section 5, and concluding discussion is given in Section 6. Extended tables of some of the results from the simulations and data analysis are given in a supplementary appendix. Computer code for the estimation in R and Mplus (both of which are needed) and replication code for the applied example are also provided as supplementary materials.

2 Models and variables

To begin with a general formulation of a latent variable model, let $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ be a vector of latent variables, and \mathbf{Y}_i and \mathbf{X}_i vectors of observed variables, for a unit of analysis i . Consider a model of the form $p(\mathbf{Y}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\mathbf{Y}_i | \boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, where $p(\cdot | \cdot)$ denotes a conditional distribution and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_2)'$ are parameters. Here $p(\mathbf{Y}_i | \boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$ is the *measurement model* for $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ and $p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ the *structural model*. The observed variables \mathbf{Y}_i (the *measurement items*) serve as measures of the latent $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$, and \mathbf{X}_i are exogenous observed explanatory variables. Endogenous observed variables can also be included, by representing them as elements of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ which are perfectly measured by single items in \mathbf{Y}_i . The parameters in $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ determine the measurement model, and we refer to them as the *measurement parameters*, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ (*structural parameters*) determine the structural model. It is assumed that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ are distinct, in the sense that the joint parameter space for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the product of the spaces for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$.

In two-step estimation, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ are estimated first and then fixed at their estimated values in the second step where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ are estimated. This is a very general approach which can in principle be used for any instance of this general model. For specificity, however, in this paper we focus on its use for a particular class of latent variable models. Here the items in \mathbf{Y}_i are categorical variables, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ are continuous and normally distributed, the structural model is recursive, and the measurement models exclude direct effects from \mathbf{X}_i to \mathbf{Y}_i . This specification is described in this section. Some further variants and extensions of it are discussed in Section 3.5.

Consider first the structural model $p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$. A general expression of it for the class of models that we focus on is

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = \mathbf{B}_0 + \mathbf{B}_\eta \boldsymbol{\eta}_i + \mathbf{B}_x \mathbf{X}_i + \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{B}_0 , \mathbf{B}_η and \mathbf{B}_x are matrices of parameters, and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ are normally distributed model residuals. This is a variant of a formulation that is commonly used to specify structural equation models in a compact and general form. For our purposes, however, it is more convenient to write the model in a different way, in terms of a chain of conditional distributions. This is possible because we consider only recursive models, obtained from (1) by imposing appropriate constraints on \mathbf{B}_η . Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iK})'$ includes $K \geq 1$ variables. Suppose further that the model specification groups them into $1 \leq M \leq K$ blocks of variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(m)}$, so that we can also write $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = (\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{i(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{i(M)})'$ in this pre-specified order. The structural model can then be written as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) &= p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)} | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{21}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(2)} | \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{22}) \\ &\quad \times \dots \times p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(M)} | \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(M-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2M}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the structural parameters are partitioned correspondingly as $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{21}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{2M})'$. It follows from (1) that all of these conditional distributions are (multivariate or univariate) normal and specified by the linear models

$$p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)} | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{21}) \sim N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{10} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1x} \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_1) \quad (3)$$

$$p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(m)} | \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(m-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2m}) \sim N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{m0} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{mx} \mathbf{X}_i + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{ml} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(l)}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_m) \quad (4)$$

for $m = 2, \dots, M$, so that each of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{21}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2M}$ consists of the corresponding $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ parameters. Constraints on elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ can be included, most often zero constraints on the $\boldsymbol{\beta}$

parameters which omit some of the explanatory variables from some parts of the model and thus yield different non-saturated choices for the overall structural model (2). If observed covariates \mathbf{X}_i are not present, they are omitted from (2)–(4). If any $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(m)}$ are actually observed (rather than latent) variables, it would also be straightforward to replace the linear model with some other model for them. For example, if $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(M)}$ is a single binary observed variable, we could specify a binary logistic model for it given \mathbf{X}_i and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(M-1)}$.

Consider then the measurement model. We assume throughout that $p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$, so that there is no non-equivalence of measurement (differential item functioning) with respect to observed covariates \mathbf{X}_i . The overall model can then be written as

$$p(\mathbf{Y}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2), \quad (5)$$

which also implies a model for the observed variables as

$$p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_i. \quad (6)$$

We make the common assumption that the items in \mathbf{Y}_i are conditionally independent of each other given $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$. Typically each latent variable in $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ is measured by only a subset of the items in \mathbf{Y}_i , and the simplest structure is obtained when each item measures exactly one variable. In that case $\mathbf{Y}_i = (\mathbf{Y}'_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}'_{iK})'$ can be partitioned corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iK})'$, so that only items in $\mathbf{Y}_{ik} = (Y_{ik1}, \dots, Y_{ikp_k})'$ are measures of η_{ik} , for each $k = 1, \dots, K$. The measurement model can then be written as

$$p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = \prod_{k=1}^K p(\mathbf{Y}_{ik}|\eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \prod_{j=1}^{p_k} p(Y_{ikj}|\eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}) \quad (7)$$

so that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{11}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{1K})'$, with the different $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}$ taken to be distinct from each other. We consider measurement models of this form in most of our specific examples for simplicity, but two-step estimation is not limited to this case. In the simulation studies Section 4 we also include models where some items measure more than one latent trait.

Specification of the measurement models for individual items Y_{ijk} depends on the forms of the items. We consider situations where each item is a categorical variable with a finite number of possible values. Most of our specific examples will be ones where the items are binary. Coding their values as 0 and 1, in that case we specify the model for each item in (7) as the logit model

$$\text{logit}[P(Y_{ijk} = 1|\eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k})] = \tau_{kj} + \lambda_{kj}\eta_{ik} \quad (8)$$

so that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k} = (\tau_{k1}, \dots, \tau_{kp_k}, \lambda_{k1}, \dots, \lambda_{kp_k})'$. In the language of item response theory modelling, this is a two-parameter logistic (2-PL) model. There can be parameter constraints within $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}$, such as taking all λ_{kj} for the same k to be equal. Other model specifications will be used if an item has $L > 2$ categories. If they are regarded as ordered, the binary model can be replaced by, for example, the ordinal logistic model $\text{logit}[P(Y_{ijk} \leq l|\eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k})] = \tau_{kjl} - \lambda_{kj}\eta_{ik}$ for categories $l = 1, \dots, L - 1$. For items with unordered categories, we can use the multinomial logistic model $\log[P(Y_{ijk} = l|\eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k})/P(Y_{ijk} = 1|\eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k})] = \tau_{kjl} + \lambda_{kj}l\eta_{ik}$ for $l = 2, \dots, L$.

3 Two-step estimation of the structural model

3.1 Two-step point estimates

Suppose that we observe $(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$ for units $i = 1, \dots, n$, assumed to be independent of each other. We use likelihood-based estimation in a parametric framework. The log-likelihood function for the class of models that we consider is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \int p(\mathbf{Y}_i | \boldsymbol{\eta}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log \int \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \prod_{j=1}^{p_k} p(Y_{ikj} | \eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}) \right] p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the structural and measurement models are specified as described in Section 2. The measurement model on the second line of (9) is for the simple measurement structure where each item measures exactly one latent variable η_{ik} , and it would be modified appropriately if this was not the case. Maximizing (9) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_2)'$ would give the overall maximum likelihood estimates (one-step estimates) of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$; we will discuss them further in Section 3.4.1. The integrals in (9) and in (10) below are not available in a closed form, so numerical integration is needed to evaluate them in estimation.

In step 1 of two-step estimation, the measurement parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ are estimated from a simpler specification. When the measurement structure is simple, this can be done separately for each η_{ik} , using the log-likelihoods

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\psi}_k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \int \left[\prod_{j=1}^{p_k} p(Y_{ikj} | \eta_{ik}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}) \right] p(\eta_{ik}; \mu_k, \sigma_k^2) d\eta_{ik} \quad (10)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$, where $p(\eta_{ik}; \mu_k, \sigma_k^2) \sim N(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2)$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_k = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_{1k}, \mu_k, \sigma_k^2)'$. Maximizing (10) gives estimate $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_k$, from which $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{1k}$ are the step-1 estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1k}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_k$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_k^2$ are discarded.

In step 2 of two-step estimation, the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ of the structural model are then estimated, holding $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ fixed at their estimates $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ from step 1. Here the log-likelihood is $\ell(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, which is of the same form as the one-step log-likelihood $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ in (9) but with the fixed values $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ substituted for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$. Maximizing this with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ gives the two-step estimate of the parameters of the structural model, which we denote by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$.

The same step-1 estimate $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ can be used for any structural models for the same $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ in step 2, for example if we want to compare models with different choices of the covariates \mathbf{X}_i or with some associations omitted in the structural model. Note also that for simplicity the notation in (9) and (10) assumes that $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and all $\ell(\boldsymbol{\psi}_k)$ use the same set of n observations. This is not necessary in general. Two-step estimation also allows partially or completely different sets of data to be used for estimating $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ in step 1 and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$ in step 2, or for estimating $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{1k}$ for different k in step 1, as long as we can assume that the same measurement model holds in all of them.

Compared with latent class models (as discussed in Bakk and Kuha 2018), there are some additional considerations here where the latent variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ are continuous. First, as usual for

any models with continuous latent variables, some parameter constraints are needed to fix the scales of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ and thus to identify the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. In two-step estimation they are imposed in the first step, and the scale implied by them then carries over to the second step where no further constraints are required. We identify the scale of each η_{ik} by fixing parameters in the measurement model, for example $\tau_{kj} = 0$ and $\lambda_{kj} = 1$ for one j in the logistic model in (8). This anchors the latent scale in the items \mathbf{Y}_i , leaving the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ free. An alternative first-step constraint would be to set $\mu_k = 0$ and $\sigma_k^2 = 1$ for all k , implying that each latent variable is on a scale where its marginal distribution is standard normal.

Another difference to typical latent class models is that in applications of latent trait models it is more common for the latent $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ to be multivariate. The measurement model can then be correspondingly more complex. Our recommendation is that step 1 of the estimation should then be divided into the simplest models that allow correct estimation of the parameters of the specified measurement model. When this model has simple structure, this means estimating single-trait models (10) for each latent trait separately. In other cases this is generalised only as far as is needed. For example, suppose that the only deviation from a simple measurement structure is that some items measure both η_{i1} and η_{i2} . Then the measurement parameters for them would be estimated from a two-trait model with a bivariate normal distribution for (η_{i1}, η_{i2}) , and the rest of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ from one-trait models for any other traits. This keeps step 1 as simple as possible, which is a key benefit of two-step estimation. An alternative would be to estimate all of the measurement models at once, from a K -trait model for a K -variate normal $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$. In other words, this would be obtained by omitting just \mathbf{X}_i from the structural model, and ignoring any parameter constraints in it. This, however, would make the first step more complex, often with no clear benefit. Rosseel and Loh (2022) give a good discussion of the considerations of how to organise step 1 in this respect. They too recommend estimating the measurement model of each distinct block of latent variables separately in most cases.

In practice some of the observed variables \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{Y}_i may be missing. Any missing items in \mathbf{Y}_i are taken to be missing at random (MAR), and their contributions are simply omitted from (9) and (10). In (9) we take \mathbf{X}_i to be complete, implying that units with any missing values in \mathbf{X}_i are omitted from estimation of the structural model. This gives valid estimates for the model as long as the missingness in \mathbf{X}_i does not depend on the response variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ (or on \mathbf{Y}_i). Multiple imputation could be used to include also incomplete observations of \mathbf{X}_i . These assumptions are conventional, and their implications are mostly the same for both two-step and one-step estimation. There are, however, some small differences which favour the two-step approach here. First, if the MAR assumption fails only for some items, say those in \mathbf{Y}_{i1} , this affects only the estimates of the measurement model they contribute to, i.e. only $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{11}$. This is because $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{1k}$ for different k are estimated separately from each other in step 1. Second, even if we omit some units with incomplete data on \mathbf{X}_i in step 2, we can still use them in step 1 where \mathbf{X}_i are not involved, hence reducing the loss of information from missing data.

3.2 Asymptotic properties and variance estimation

The properties of the step-2 estimates $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$ follow from the general theory of pseudo-maximum likelihood (PML) estimation (Gong and Samaniego, 1981). Much of the presentation here is similar to that of Bakk and Kuha (2018) for latent class models, because the general form of these results is the same irrespective of the details of the model specification.

PML refers to the general approach where one set of parameters of a model (here θ_1) are estimated first, and their estimates are then treated as known in a log likelihood (here $\ell(\tilde{\theta}_1, \theta_2)$) that is maximized to estimate a second set of parameters (θ_2). PML estimators are consistent and asymptotically normally distributed under very general regularity conditions. In our situation these require, broadly, that the joint model is such that the one-step ML estimator $\hat{\theta}$ is consistent for θ , that the values of θ_1 and θ_2 can vary independently of each other, and that the step-1 estimator $\tilde{\theta}_1$ is consistent for θ_1 . Here these conditions are satisfied, with the partial exception of one approximation which is discussed further at the end of this section.

To get the variance matrix of $\tilde{\theta}_2$, let the Fisher information matrix for θ in the full model be

$$\mathcal{I}(\theta^*) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{I}_{11} & \\ \mathcal{I}'_{12} & \mathcal{I}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

where θ^* denotes the true value of θ and the partitioning corresponds to θ_1 and θ_2 . Let Σ_{11}/n be the asymptotic variance matrix of the step-1 estimator $\tilde{\theta}_1$. The asymptotic variance matrix of the two-step estimator $\tilde{\theta}_2$ is then $\text{var}(\tilde{\theta}_2) = \mathbf{V}/n$, where

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} + \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} \mathcal{I}'_{12} \Sigma_{11} \mathcal{I}_{12} \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} \equiv \mathbf{V}_2 + \mathbf{V}_1 \quad (12)$$

(if $\tilde{\theta}_1$ was obtained using $n_1 \neq n$ of observations, Σ_{11} is multiplied by (n/n_1) in this; see Xue and Bandeen-Roche (2002) and Bakk and Kuha (2018)). Here \mathbf{V}_2 describes the variability in $\tilde{\theta}_2$ if θ_1 were known, and \mathbf{V}_1 the additional variability arising from estimating θ_1 by $\tilde{\theta}_1$.

The estimated variance matrix of $\tilde{\theta}_2$ is $\hat{\text{var}}(\tilde{\theta}_2) = \hat{\mathbf{V}}/n$, where $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = \hat{\mathbf{V}}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{V}}_1$, and the estimates of these matrices are obtained by substituting $\tilde{\theta} = (\tilde{\theta}'_1, \tilde{\theta}'_2)'$ for θ^* in \mathcal{I}_{22} and \mathcal{I}_{12} and substituting an estimate of Σ_{11} . The estimate of \mathcal{I}_{22} is obtained from step 2, while that of \mathcal{I}_{12} requires some additional calculation (this is discussed in Section 3.3).

For Σ_{11} we need an estimate of the variance matrix Σ_{11}/n of $\tilde{\theta}_1$ from step 1 of the estimation. Here some new questions arise when $\eta_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iK})'$ is a vector, with corresponding measurement parameters $\theta_1 = (\theta'_{11}, \dots, \theta'_{1K})'$. Suppose that each $\tilde{\theta}_{1k}$ was estimated separately in step 1. Consider Σ_{11} divided into diagonal blocks $\Sigma_{11(kk)} = n \text{var}(\tilde{\theta}_{1k})$ and off-diagonal blocks $\Sigma_{11(kl)} = n \text{cov}(\tilde{\theta}_{1k}, \tilde{\theta}_{1l})$ for each $k, l = 1, \dots, K$, and denote the Fisher information matrices for ψ_k in (10) by $\mathcal{I}_{*11(k)}$. The $\Sigma_{11(kk)}$ are obtained by extracting the elements corresponding to θ_{1k} from $\mathcal{I}_{*11(k)}^{-1}$, and estimates $\tilde{\Sigma}_{11(kk)}$ by substituting $\tilde{\psi}_k$ in them. The off-diagonal blocks, however, cannot be obtained from these step-1 information matrices. What we do here is to set $\tilde{\Sigma}_{11(kl)} = \mathbf{0}$ for $k \neq l$. This is a simplifying approximation, because even though $\tilde{\theta}_{1k}$ and $\tilde{\theta}_{1l}$ are estimated from separate models, they can still be correlated because they use the data on \mathbf{Y}_{ik} and \mathbf{Y}_{il} for the same units i . The same approach is taken by Rosseel and Loh (2022) for their SAM implementation. It seems quite justified at least in our simulations in Section 4, where it has no effect on the accuracy of the variance estimation.

Alternatively, a way of estimating these cross-block covariances could be derived from general results on estimation equations (see Cameron and Trivedi, 2005, Chapter 5). Let $\mathbf{s}_{ik}(\psi_k)$ denote the contribution of unit i to the score function for the step-1 log-likelihood (10), define $\mathbf{B}_{kl} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{s}_{ki}(\tilde{\psi}_{1k}) \mathbf{s}_{li}(\tilde{\psi}_{1l})'$, and let $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{*11(k)}$ be obtained by substituting $\tilde{\psi}_k$ for ψ_k in $\mathcal{I}_{*11(k)}$. Then $\Sigma_{11(kl)}$ is estimated by the submatrix of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{*11(k)}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{kl} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{*11(l)}^{-1}$ for the rows corresponding to $\tilde{\theta}_{1k}$ and the columns for $\tilde{\theta}_{1l}$. However, the $\mathbf{s}_{ik}(\psi_k)$ may not be easily available from standard

software. Bootstrap methods could also be considered for the variance estimation. Implementing them for two-step estimation may raise interesting further questions, which remain to be investigated in future research. Another approach that is comparable in spirit to bootstrapping has been proposed by Levy (2023). In it, the combined uncertainty from the two steps is accounted for by drawing values of the measurement parameters from their posterior distribution from step 1 and then carrying out (Bayesian) estimation for step 2 given each of these draws.

In practical data analysis, we could also choose to omit \mathbf{V}_1 from the variance. This would mean, in effect, that once step 1 was done we would be treating the measurement model obtained from it, and thus the definition of the latent variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$, as known and fixed rather than as an estimable characteristic. Estimated structural models obtained from step 2 would then be models for this definition of latent variables. This is close in spirit to the approach that is also almost always adopted in naive three-step estimation, as discussed further in Section 3.4.2 below. This may be desirable or unproblematic in many applications. When it is not, however, omitting the contribution from \mathbf{V}_1 may result in serious underestimation of the variance of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$.

Consider, finally, the potential deviation from the conditions of PML estimation that was mentioned above. It is a distributional inconsistency which can arise when the latent variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ are continuous. We assume throughout this paper that the conditional distributions for $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ are normal, as shown in (3)–(4). This also implies that $p(\eta_{ik}|\mathbf{X}_i)$ is univariate normal for all k . The marginal distribution of any single latent trait is then $p(\eta_{ik}) = \int p(\eta_{ik}|\mathbf{X}_i)p(\mathbf{X}_i) d\mathbf{X}_i$ where $p(\mathbf{X}_i)$ is the joint sample distribution of \mathbf{X}_i . This $p(\eta_{ik})$ is not normal unless $p(\mathbf{X}_i)$ is also normal. The marginal normal distribution that we assume in (10) for η_{ik} (and any multivariate normal distributions for multiple traits which may be used in step 1) is thus misspecified to some extent, if the structural model includes non-normal covariates \mathbf{X}_i . Literature on latent trait models with misspecified distributions of the trait (see e.g. Manapat and Edwards, 2022, and references therein) indicates that estimates of the measurement parameters can then be biased, with a bias that depends on the true distribution of η_{ik} and is largest when it is very skewed. In two-step estimation this would be a concern if such bias in $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ from step 1 also translated into bias in $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$ from step 2. We examine this situation in the simulations in Section 4. There we do not observe any meaningful bias of this kind in $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$, even when the true trait distribution in step 1 is very skewed. Taking the latent traits to be normally distributed also in step 1 thus seems empirically justified. We note also that the same approximation is routinely made also in one-step estimation when we consider different choices of \mathbf{X}_i and take η_{ik} be normally distributed given any of them (which cannot be exactly true for all of them).

3.3 Implementation of the estimation

Software that can do one-step estimation of a model can also be used for two-step estimation of it. We have used Mplus 6.12 software (Muthén and Muthén, 2010) for the simulation studies and application example of this paper. We have supplemented it with functions in R (R Core Team, 2022) to manage the estimation process. This automatically sequences the two steps of estimation, passing the estimated parameter values from the first step to the code for the second and the estimates back to R. We have used the *MplusAutomation* package in R (Hallquist and Wiley, 2018) to control Mplus from R, and the *brew* package (Horner, 2011) to automatically edit the input files. Examples of the estimation code are included in supplementary materials for the paper.

Because the log likelihood functions can have multiple local maxima, it is desirable to use multiple starting values for the estimation algorithm. This is a standard feature in software such as Mplus. High-quality software is also needed to implement and control the numerical integration that is needed in all parts of the estimation. These numerical challenges apply to both two-step and one-step estimation of latent trait models, although the starting point issue may be somewhat smaller for the simpler two-step approach.

The matrix \mathcal{I}_{12} in (12) requires separate attention. An estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{12}$ of it should be obtained as the off-diagonal block of the information matrix $\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ in (11), evaluated at the final estimates $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_1, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_2)'$. This is not produced by the two-step estimation procedure described so far, because in its second step $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ are treated as fixed numbers and omitted from the information matrix. So calculating $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{12}$ requires an additional step. We have obtained it by a further call to Mplus, where one-step estimation is started from $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{12}$ is taken from the information matrix of this after one iteration. This is only approximately correct because that one iteration means that \mathcal{I}_{12} is in the end evaluated at a value which differs to some extent from $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Even with it, however, the estimated standard errors perform well in our simulations.

3.4 Alternatives: One- and three-step estimation

3.4.1 One-step estimation

The main alternative to two-estimation is *one-step estimation*. It means obtaining maximum likelihood (ML) estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2)$ of the measurement parameters and structural parameters together, by maximizing the log-likelihood (9) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. This can be done using the same software (in our applications Mplus) that can also be used for two-step estimation.

If the model is correctly specified, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ has the standard asymptotic properties of ML estimates. It is consistent for the true $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$, and its asymptotic variance matrix is $\mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)/n$. Here it is interesting to examine the form of the variance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$. Denote it by $\text{var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2) = \mathbf{V}_{ML}/n$, where \mathbf{V}_{ML} is the block of $\mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$. Applying rules for inverting partitioned matrices to (11), we can also write

$$\mathbf{V}_{ML} = \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} + \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} \mathcal{I}'_{12} \mathcal{I}^{11} \mathcal{I}_{12} \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{I}^{11} = (\mathcal{I}_{11} - \mathcal{I}_{12} \mathcal{I}_{22}^{-1} \mathcal{I}'_{12})^{-1}$ is the block of $\mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$. Comparing (13) with (12), we can see that they differ only in that \mathbf{V}_{ML} has $\mathcal{I}^{11} = n \text{var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1)$ where \mathbf{V} had $\Sigma_{11} = n \text{var}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1)$. In other words, the only difference between the asymptotic variance matrices of the one-step and two-step estimates of the structural parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ is in how much uncertainty they incorporate about estimates of the measurement parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$. Two-step (step-1) estimates of the measurement parameters of each latent variable η_{ik} use only information from the items that measure that η_{ik} , whereas one-step estimates also use information from the measurement items of other latent variables and from any observed covariates \mathbf{X}_i . Because the additional information provided by the latter is typically small, we would expect the variances of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$ to be very similar. That of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2$ can even be smaller, in situations where step 1 of two-step estimation is based on more data than is used for one-step estimation.

3.4.2 Naive three-step estimation

Three-step estimation is a stepwise approach. Its first step is the same as in the two-step method, i.e. obtaining estimates $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ of the measurement parameters from simplest possible models. In the second step, these are used to calculate predicted values $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ for the latent variables, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$; $k = 1, \dots, K$. In the third step, the structural model is estimated with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i = (\tilde{\eta}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{iK})'$ substituted for $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ and treated as observed variables. For the recursive model (2)–(4) this means simply fitting the M regression models for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{i(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{i(M)}$ separately. Estimated variances of the parameter estimates are also obtained as in standard regression, in effect treating $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ like any observed variables. We refer to this version of the approach as “naive” three-step estimation.

The predictions (or “latent trait scores”) $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ could be obtained in different ways. The most common, and the ones we use here, are the conditional expected values (empirical Bayes predictions) $\tilde{\eta}_{ik} = E(\eta_{ik} | \mathbf{Y}_{i(k)}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_{(k)})$, where $\mathbf{Y}_{i(k)}$ denotes those items which were included in step-1 estimation of the measurement model for η_{ik} and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_{(k)}$ the estimated parameters of this model. These $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ require numerical integration, but they are normally provided by estimation software.

This approach is “naive” because in most cases it produces biased estimates of the parameters of the structural model. This is because $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ are erroneously measured versions of η_{ik} . Trying to correct for this bias leads to “adjusted” versions of three-step estimation, which we discuss in the next section. Before that, however, it is worth noting that whether we would want to do that depends on what we think the goal of three-step estimation is. Measurement error bias is a problem if we want to treat the step-3 models as estimates of the regression models (2)–(4) for the latent variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$. But it is not a problem if we view them instead as estimates for the same models for the scores $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$ themselves. In other words, we can choose to treat $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$ as variables of interest rather than as poor measures of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$. In this view, steps 1 and 2 of the analysis become data reduction steps which are used only to develop a calculation that reduces \mathbf{Y}_i to these $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$. This also an entirely coherent approach to data analysis, if it is substantively interesting and justified. Here, however, we focus on the situation where models for the latent $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ are the goal, because it is also what motivates two-step and one-step estimation.

3.4.3 Adjusted three-step estimation

The goal of adjusted three-step estimation is to obtain valid estimates of the structural model $p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ based on a model for $p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, treating $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$ as a known function of \mathbf{Y}_i . Naive three-step estimation is based on the approximation $p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) \approx p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, which is generally incorrect. The correct distribution is of the form

$$p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) = \int p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i | \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) d\boldsymbol{\eta}. \quad (14)$$

Note that here we deviate slightly from previous notation, to make one point clearer below. This is that the latent variables are denoted not as $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$, but as $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_{.1}, \dots, \eta_{.K})'$ to emphasise the fact that in (14) they are integration variables and not fixed values for units i . Adjusted three-step estimation could be based on the right-hand side or left-hand side of (14), and this has been done for other families of latent variable models. For latent trait models, however, this approach is less promising, because it is either redundant or unavailable as a general method.

Consider first the right-hand side of (14). This is still a latent variable model, but with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$ rather than \mathbf{Y}_i as the observed measurement indicators. It is thus like step 2 of two-step estimation, but applied to $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$. To implement it, we would first need to derive the form of the distribution $p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta})$. This is fairly easy for latent class models, where \mathbf{Y}_i , $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$ are all categorical, and estimation based on this approach has been developed there by Vermunt (2010) and Bakk et al. (2013). It could also be straightforward for normal structural equation models (SEMs), but it has not been examined in full in that literature (perhaps because other three-step methods discussed below are then more natural and straightforward). Savalei (2018) considered it for SEMs in the special case where $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ are equally-weighted sum scores of the measurement items.

To examine the situation for latent trait models, suppose for simplicity that all the items Y_{ikj} are binary and that the measurement model is (7), i.e. that the different traits η_k are measured by the distinct sets of items $\mathbf{Y}_{ik} = (Y_{ik1}, \dots, Y_{ikp_k})'$. We can then write (14) as

$$p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) = \int \left[\prod_{k=1}^K p(\tilde{\eta}_{ik}|\eta_k) \right] p(\boldsymbol{\eta}|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) d\boldsymbol{\eta}. \quad (15)$$

Here $\tilde{\eta}_{ik} = E(\eta_k|\mathbf{Y}_{ik})$ are the empirical Bayes predictions, which are not available in a closed form. For purposes of this discussion, however, it is reasonable to approximate them by the weighted sums $\tilde{\eta}_{ik} \approx \sum_j a_{kj} Y_{ikj}$, where a_{kj} are functions of the step-1 parameter estimates $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_k$. As a function of the random vector \mathbf{Y}_{ik} , this $\tilde{\eta}_{ik} = \tilde{\eta}_{ik}(\mathbf{Y}_{ik})$ is a discrete random variable with 2^{p_k} possible values, many of which will have very low probability for a given η_k , and with mean $\sum_j a_{kj} \pi_{ikj}(\eta_k)$ and variance $\text{var}(\tilde{\eta}_{ik}|\eta_k) = \sum_j a_{kj}^2 \pi_{ikj}(\eta_k)[1 - \pi_{ikj}(\eta_k)]$ where $\pi_{ikj}(\eta_k) = P(Y_{ikj} = 1|\eta_k)$ is given by the measurement model (8). The $p(\tilde{\eta}_{ik}|\eta_k)$ in (15) is the probability function of this distribution, evaluated at the observed value of $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$.

Adjusted three-step estimation of this kind has been proposed for latent trait models by Lai and Hsiao (2022). They approximate $p(\tilde{\eta}_{ik}|\eta_k)$ by a normal distribution with mean η_k (when η_k is taken to have variance 1) and variance $\text{v\hat{a}r}(\eta_k|\tilde{\eta}_{ik})$ (which can be obtained from estimation software). This, however, is not correct in general, because $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ is not normally distributed and because the variance of $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ given η_k is not equal to the variance of η_k given $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ and not constant as a function of η_k . It is not clear when this approximation would be adequate in practice. It seems that it would require, at least, that $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ and η_k are scaled to have the same marginal variance and that $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$ is approximately normally distributed (which requires at least large p_k) and has roughly the same variance given all the values of η_k which make a non-trivial contribution to the integral in (15).

There is, however, a different way of obtaining these three-step estimates. Consider again binary items, and suppose that all estimated measurement models (8) for different items Y_{ikj} for η_k are different from each other. The weights a_{kj} in the approximation $\tilde{\eta}_{ik} \approx \sum_j a_{kj} Y_{ikj}$ are then also all different, so that every possible value of \mathbf{Y}_{ik} gives a distinct value of $\tilde{\eta}_{ik} = \tilde{\eta}_{ik}(\mathbf{Y}_{ik})$ almost surely. When this is the case, $p(\tilde{\eta}_{ik}|\eta_k) = p(\mathbf{Y}_{ik}|\eta_k)$ and $p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ in (15) is equal to the $p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ that would be used for step 2 of two-step estimation. It would seem that the same argument holds also for the exact values of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$, and when any items Y_{ikj} are polytomous. In other words, if all the items have different estimated measurement parameters, there is almost surely a one-to-one relationship between distinct values of \mathbf{Y}_i and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$. Adjusted three-step estimation based on the right-hand side of (14), if correctly implemented, would then give the same estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ as two-step estimation which uses the same step-1 estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ — but would deliver them with more effort for no gain. If different items had identical measurement

models (most likely because they were constrained to be so), this kind of three-step estimation would require separate implementation, but this would again be effectively pointless because it would in the end reflect essentially the same information that two-step estimation uses more easily. We do not consider such three-step estimates further in this paper.

Adjusted three-step estimation based on the left-hand side of (14) means estimating $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ from a closed-form model $p(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ which is obtained by first evaluating the integral in (14). This is again relatively straightforward for latent class models (see Bolck et al. 2004, Vermunt 2010, and Bakk et al. 2013). It is also convenient for linear SEMs, where it means obtaining closed-form expressions for the mean vector and covariance matrix of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$ and using them to estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ (see Croon 2002, Devlieger and Rosseel 2017, and references therein).

For latent trait models this would require a sufficiently good approximation of the integral which would also yield a conveniently estimable model. That is not generally available. In some cases, however, a version of it can be derived. Suppose that the interesting part of the structural model is $\eta_{2i} = \beta_{20} + \beta_{21}\eta_{1i} + \psi_{2i}$, with no covariates \mathbf{X}_i . Suppose further that we use for η_{1i} the Empirical Bayes score $\tilde{\eta}_{1i} = E(\eta_{1i}|\mathbf{Y}_{i1})$, and for η_{2i} a unbiased score $\check{\eta}_{2i}$ for which $E(\check{\eta}_{2i}|\eta_{2i}) = \eta_{2i}$. Then we have $\check{\eta}_{2i} = \beta_{20} + \beta_{21}\tilde{\eta}_{1i} + \psi_{2i}^*$, so that (β_{20}, β_{21}) can be estimated from a linear regression model for $\check{\eta}_{2i}$ given $\tilde{\eta}_{1i}$ (which has a heteroscedastic residual ψ_{2i}^* , but this can be allowed for in the estimation). For this model and these trait scores, naive and adjusted three-step estimation are thus the same. This situation was described for SEMs by Skrondal and Laake (2001), using regression factor scores as $\tilde{\eta}_{1i}$ and Bartlett factor scores as $\check{\eta}_{2i}$. Lu and Thomas (2008) showed that the same construction would work also for latent trait models, but they also noted that for these models there are no unbiased scores to be used as $\check{\eta}_{2i}$ (the best that can be obtained is consistency as the number of items increases).

This approach would not generalise well to more complex models. For example, suppose that the structural model includes a further latent variable η_{3i} and the model $\eta_{3i} = \beta_{30} + \beta_{31}\eta_{1i} + \beta_{32}\eta_{2i} + \psi_{3i}$. The scores that should be assigned for (η_{1i}, η_{2i}) to estimate this model would be $E[(\eta_{1i}, \eta_{2i})|\mathbf{Y}_{1i}, \mathbf{Y}_{2i}]$, i.e. predictions given both of their indicators (Skrondal and Laake 2001, Lu and Thomas 2008); these should also be conditional on any covariates \mathbf{X}_i in the structural model. To get these, we would need to fit the step-1 model for η_{1i} and η_{2i} jointly rather than separately. Furthermore, the appropriate trait scores to assign for η_{1i} and η_{2i} would be different for the model for η_{3i} than for the model for η_{2i} , and different again for any further parts of the structural model. This could quickly get very impracticable for larger models. We do not consider this version of adjusted three-step estimation further in this paper, except for some examples with only a single explanatory latent trait in the simulation studies below.

3.5 Two-step estimation for other types of models

Two-step estimation could in principle be applied to any instance of the general latent variable model that was defined at the start of Section 2. To provide a focus for this paper, we concentrate on the family of latent trait models that was introduced later in Section 2. Before proceeding to empirical investigations of them, we comment briefly on other settings where the two-step method could be used. Some of them are obvious extensions or variants of the models considered here, while others could involve more consequential differences. Implementation and performance of two-step estimation in many of these other cases remain to be examined.

In the measurement model we made the assumption that $p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = p(\mathbf{Y}_i|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$. Relaxing this would take us to models with non-equivalence of measurement with respect to the observed covariates \mathbf{X}_i . Two-step estimation in that situation can introduce new issues, and deserves further investigation. For latent class models, it has been studied by Di Mari and Bakk (2018), Janssen et al. (2019) and Vermunt and Magidson (2021a).

We made the common assumption that all items in \mathbf{Y}_i are conditionally independent given the latent traits $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$. This could be relaxed by allowing conditional associations between some items, requiring only corresponding modifications of the log likelihoods (9) and (10). Another obvious class of extensions would be obtained by considering models with mixtures of different types of measurement items. In this paper we focus on categorical items, while linear structural equation models (as in Rosseel and Loh 2022) take the items to be continuous. But some applications may involve both of these types, or others such as counts or survival times as measurement items. Similarly, the structural model could include both categorical and continuous latent variables, and categorical variables could be measured not only by categorical items (as in standard latent class analysis discussed by Bakk and Kuha 2018) but also by continuous ones (the case known as latent profile analysis). It seems plausible that the behaviour of the two-step method would not be fundamentally different in these different combinations of settings.

Generalisations of the structural model could also include such possibilities as interactions or nonlinear terms of the latent variables, or non-recursive models. Two-step estimation in these cases has not been examined. It could behave differently there, if only because such models are inherently more complex and difficult howsoever they are estimated.

One extension that is easily accommodated is multigroup modelling. This means models for data on units from different groups, such as respondents from different countries in cross-national research. The focus of interest is then on how the parameters of the structural model do or do not vary between the groups. The simplest version of this is to include dummy variables for the groups in \mathbf{X}_i , thus giving separate intercepts for different groups in the structural models (3)–(4). Beyond this, latent variable modelling software such as Mplus also have dedicated multigroup syntax which allows any of the parameters to vary by the group. This can also be combined with two-step estimation. In the applied example in Section 5 we use it to fit a model to cross-sectional survey data from 36 countries, where all the regression coefficients and all residual variances and covariances in the structural model vary between the countries.

4 Simulations

4.1 First set of simulations

We have used simulation studies to examine the properties of two-step estimates for the types of models considered in this paper. In this section we describe them for one model setting in detail. In Section 4.2 we then describe further simulations in several other settings.

The properties that we examine include the performance of the point estimates and accuracy of the estimated standard errors. The main comparison of interest is with one-step estimates of the same models. Since they are full maximum likelihood estimates, they serve as a benchmark whose theoretical properties are well understood. In large samples one-step estimates should be unbiased and fully efficient, and it is then interesting to see if two-step estimates do roughly as well. In smaller samples, either approach could have an advantage. In this section all the models are correctly specified, but in the next we also include simulations with a misspecified measurement model in order to examine the robustness of the estimates in such cases. Another point of comparison is computational demands, where two-step estimation should have the advantage. The simulation results also include (naive) three-step estimates, but they are not discussed here. We will comment on the results for them separately in Section 4.3.

In these first simulations the structural model for unit $i = 1, \dots, n$ is of the form

$$\eta_{i2} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \eta_{i1} + \epsilon_i \quad (16)$$

where η_{1i} and η_{2i} are latent variables and ϵ_i is the model residual. Here $\eta_{1i} \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$, $\beta_0 = 0$, and $(\beta_1, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ are such that marginally $\eta_{2i} \sim N(0, 1)$ in all simulation settings. The value of β_1 is set so that the R^2 statistic for the response η_{i2} is $R^2 = 0, 0.2$, or 0.4 . We refer to this as *simulation case A*. Path diagram for this model is shown in Figure A.1 in the supplementary appendix.

The latent variable η_{i1} is measured by p binary items Y_{i1j} , coded with values 0 and 1, and η_{i2} by a different set of p binary items similarly, with $p = 4$ or $p = 8$. All items are conditionally independent of each other given the latent variables. The measurement model is of the form $\text{logit}[P(Y_{ikj} = 1 | \eta_{ik})] = \tau_{kj} + \lambda_{kj} \eta_{ik}$ for $k = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$. The measurement parameters $(\tau_{kj}, \lambda_{kj})$ are estimated as distinct parameters for different k, j , but their true values $\tau_{kj} = \tau$ and $\lambda_{kj} = \lambda$ in the data-generating model are set to be equal for all items in a given simulation. The loading parameter λ is set with reference to the linear model for a notional continuous latent variable Y_{ikj}^* which implies the logistic model for Y_{ikj} . Here R^2 for Y_{ikj}^* given η_{ik} is $R_Y^2 = \lambda^2 \text{var}(\eta_{ik}) / (\lambda^2 \text{var}(\eta_{ik}) + \pi^2/3)$ where $\text{var}(\eta_{ik}) = 1$, and λ is set so that $R_Y^2 = 0.4$ or 0.6 . The values of τ are then set so that the marginal probability $\pi_Y = P(Y_{ikj} = 1)$ is 0.5 or (approximately) 0.8. When the model is estimated, we constrain $\tau_{k1} = 0$ and $\lambda_{k1} = 1$ for the first item Y_{ik1} of each latent variable, leaving τ_{kj} and λ_{kj} for the other $p - 1$ items estimable. This affects the implied scales of the latent variables, so that the value of β_1 that the estimators should actually be estimating will depend also on the value of λ in the data-generating model. These true values of β_1 are shown in the results tables.

In each setting we generate 1000 simulated datasets with $n = 200$ or $n = 1000$ independent observations i . All combinations of n , R^2 , p , π_Y and R_Y^2 are considered, resulting in 48 settings.

The two-step, one-step and naive three-step estimates are calculated. Two-step estimation was implemented as described in Section 3.3. The same R functions we wrote for it (combined with Mplus) also produced the one-step and three-step estimates.

We focus on the results for the estimates of the regression coefficient β_1 in the structural model (simulation results for the measurement model are discussed briefly in Section 4.2). These results are shown in Table 1 for the point estimates and Table 2 for the standard errors. For the point estimates, the table includes their mean bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and median absolute error (MAE). To examine the estimated standard errors, we report the standard deviation of the point estimates of β_1 and the mean of their estimated standard errors across the simulations, and simulation coverage of the 95% confidence intervals. For the two-step estimates we also report two quantities for the case where we ignore the uncertainty from step 1 (i.e. omit the contribution from \mathbf{V}_1 to (12)) and include only the uncertainty from step 2 in the standard errors: the average proportion of the full estimated variance of the two-step estimate of β_1 that this accounts for, and the coverage of the resulting 95% confidence interval.

Consider first the point estimates of β_1 in Table 1. There is no meaningful difference between two-step and one-step estimates for the larger sample size of $n = 1000$. They also behave very similarly in almost all settings when $n = 200$, except for some differences when the number of items is small ($p = 4$), the measurement model is weak ($R_Y^2 = 0.4$) and one of the values of the items is rare ($\pi_Y = 0.8$). This is the setting where the items provide the least information about the latent variables. When β_1 is 0, the two-step estimates have in these cases a slightly better RMSE and MAE than the one-step estimates. With larger values of β_1 , on the other hand, in a few simulations these cases yield an extreme value of the two-step estimate, inflating its RMSE. These extremes are reduced for the one-step estimates, most likely because the measurement models of η_1 and η_2 stabilise each other when they are estimated together.

Results for the estimated standard errors of the estimates of β_1 are reported in Table 2. They are very satisfactory when $n = 1000$: for both the two-step and one-step methods the standard errors are good estimates of the simulation standard deviations of estimates of β_1 , and coverages of confidence intervals are close to the nominal 95%. With the smaller sample size of $n = 200$ this coverage is less correct, ranging from 89% to 100% in different settings. The estimated standard errors are even then reasonably accurate when the estimated measurement model is sufficiently informative. In the most difficult settings, with a small sample, weak measurement model and small number of items, the standard errors tend to underestimate the true variability.

The last two columns of Table 2 examine what happens if we ignore the uncertainty from step 1 of two-step estimation, i.e. if we calculate its standard errors using only the term \mathbf{V}_2 in the variance formula (12). Here this step-2 variance accounts for almost all of the variance of the estimate of β_1 when the true β_1 is 0, but much less otherwise, down to less than a third of the overall variance in the settings with the largest β_1 . The coverage of confidence intervals is correspondingly reduced, down to less than 70%. When the association in the structural model is strong, the uncertainty in its estimates is thus dominated by the uncertainty in the estimated measurement parameters from step 1.

Table 1: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed latent response η_2 (simulation case A).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.004	-0.003	-0.002	0.133	0.141	0.081	0.077	0.080	0.046
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.007	-0.004	-0.000	0.240	0.276	0.110	0.101	0.113	0.044
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.007	0.007	0.005	0.115	0.117	0.080	0.069	0.070	0.048
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.153	0.154	0.091	0.081	0.084	0.048
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.104	0.104	0.078	0.063	0.062	0.047
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.147	0.151	0.087	0.081	0.083	0.047
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.003	-0.003	-0.002	0.097	0.095	0.077	0.062	0.059	0.050
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.000	0.114	0.116	0.080	0.072	0.073	0.050
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.016	0.035	-0.162	0.236	0.237	0.221	0.132	0.132	0.202
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.031	0.070	-0.208	0.404	0.385	0.300	0.183	0.177	0.267
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.019	0.025	-0.116	0.182	0.189	0.176	0.117	0.116	0.148
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.030	0.039	-0.144	0.257	0.244	0.225	0.135	0.134	0.183
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.013	0.010	-0.104	0.177	0.188	0.170	0.109	0.110	0.137
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.023	0.040	-0.152	0.249	0.250	0.222	0.144	0.136	0.197
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.005	-0.008	-0.081	0.143	0.159	0.143	0.092	0.093	0.116
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.024	0.028	-0.100	0.183	0.181	0.170	0.114	0.111	0.137
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.028	0.047	-0.223	0.309	0.285	0.301	0.176	0.162	0.268
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.042	0.081	-0.284	0.608	0.457	0.436	0.228	0.199	0.363
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.048	0.052	-0.143	0.275	0.254	0.247	0.140	0.147	0.199
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.038	0.048	-0.195	0.326	0.283	0.295	0.174	0.161	0.255
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.020	0.022	-0.142	0.213	0.222	0.216	0.131	0.134	0.176
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.033	0.054	-0.204	0.344	0.346	0.309	0.177	0.166	0.258
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.033	0.006	-0.087	0.196	0.227	0.182	0.127	0.124	0.138
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.024	0.030	-0.138	0.223	0.218	0.220	0.137	0.135	0.180
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.054	0.032	0.036	0.036	0.021
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	0.072	0.073	0.032	0.049	0.049	0.021
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.045	0.045	0.031	0.030	0.030	0.021
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.054	0.055	0.032	0.036	0.036	0.021
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.045	0.045	0.033	0.031	0.031	0.023
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.059	0.059	0.034	0.038	0.038	0.022
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	0.040	0.040	0.032	0.026	0.026	0.021
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.045	0.045	0.032	0.030	0.030	0.021
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.006	0.012	-0.174	0.092	0.090	0.183	0.061	0.059	0.178
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.011	0.021	-0.227	0.124	0.124	0.236	0.078	0.077	0.234
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.001	0.003	-0.131	0.075	0.074	0.142	0.053	0.052	0.135
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.011	0.013	-0.160	0.091	0.090	0.171	0.057	0.059	0.168
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.004	0.005	-0.112	0.073	0.073	0.125	0.047	0.047	0.116
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.010	0.015	-0.163	0.094	0.093	0.174	0.062	0.061	0.166
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.002	0.003	-0.084	0.062	0.062	0.098	0.039	0.039	0.087
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.008	0.009	-0.113	0.074	0.074	0.126	0.048	0.048	0.118
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.009	0.014	-0.244	0.118	0.112	0.255	0.076	0.076	0.250
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.003	0.014	-0.319	0.156	0.150	0.329	0.103	0.099	0.329
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.006	0.007	-0.177	0.093	0.090	0.190	0.061	0.058	0.182
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.009	0.010	-0.218	0.117	0.109	0.232	0.074	0.071	0.223
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.003	0.005	-0.158	0.088	0.086	0.172	0.059	0.057	0.164
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	-0.001	0.007	-0.231	0.114	0.111	0.244	0.078	0.072	0.237
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.007	0.008	-0.110	0.080	0.079	0.128	0.054	0.053	0.112
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.006	0.008	-0.152	0.088	0.086	0.167	0.060	0.058	0.156

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 the true value of β_1 .

Table 2: Simulation results for standard error estimates of estimated structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed latent response η_2 (simulation case A).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)					
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.133	0.137	0.141	0.138	99.5	99.3	95.6	87.3	96.0
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.240	0.224	0.276	0.235	99.9	100.0	94.7	78.0	96.0
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.115	0.114	0.116	0.114	98.9	98.5	94.3	91.4	94.9
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.153	0.146	0.154	0.145	99.2	98.6	94.2	88.2	95.1
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.105	0.105	0.105	0.102	98.5	98.5	95.7	92.5	95.8
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.147	0.143	0.151	0.143	99.3	99.0	95.0	87.1	95.9
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.097	0.095	0.095	0.090	98.4	98.1	95.5	94.3	95.7
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.115	0.112	0.116	0.112	99.1	99.0	94.5	92.1	95.0
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.236	0.223	0.235	0.217	90.5	90.5	36.8	41.3	77.9
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.403	0.333	0.378	0.331	88.5	90.3	28.2	41.6	75.4
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.181	0.183	0.187	0.178	92.8	92.7	48.6	43.3	82.8
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.256	0.230	0.241	0.219	91.5	91.9	38.4	42.8	79.3
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.176	0.162	0.188	0.160	90.7	89.3	48.7	39.7	77.0
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.248	0.226	0.247	0.226	91.1	91.8	36.5	39.7	75.1
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.143	0.143	0.159	0.137	92.1	90.0	57.4	42.3	78.9
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.181	0.175	0.179	0.171	92.1	92.6	51.4	40.9	78.5
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.308	0.295	0.281	0.263	91.9	92.7	28.6	27.3	72.2
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.607	0.439	0.450	0.385	89.7	92.8	19.9	27.9	69.6
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.271	0.254	0.248	0.229	94.0	94.6	36.7	28.8	73.8
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.324	0.316	0.279	0.267	93.2	94.5	29.5	28.3	71.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.212	0.208	0.221	0.203	92.5	92.5	40.7	24.9	66.1
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.342	0.284	0.342	0.280	91.0	92.7	27.6	24.6	65.1
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.193	0.189	0.227	0.175	94.6	90.2	47.7	25.9	66.8
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.221	0.218	0.216	0.211	93.2	94.1	38.4	26.2	68.5
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.053	0.054	0.054	0.054	95.9	95.7	95.1	97.1	95.1
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.072	0.076	0.073	0.076	97.9	97.2	96.3	95.1	96.3
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.046	0.045	0.046	96.5	96.4	95.2	98.3	95.4
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.054	0.056	0.055	0.056	96.8	96.8	95.9	97.6	96.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.044	0.045	0.044	95.3	95.2	94.5	98.2	94.5
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.059	0.056	0.059	0.056	95.0	94.8	93.7	96.9	94.0
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.040	0.040	0.040	0.040	96.1	95.9	95.2	98.8	95.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.046	0.046	0.046	96.3	96.2	95.1	98.4	95.3
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.092	0.091	0.089	0.089	94.4	95.4	5.9	41.6	79.5
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.124	0.123	0.122	0.120	93.6	94.1	3.2	42.6	80.2
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.075	0.076	0.074	0.074	94.8	94.6	12.6	43.8	79.3
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.090	0.090	0.089	0.089	96.0	95.8	8.4	43.8	81.3
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.073	0.070	0.073	0.069	93.9	94.6	18.8	39.3	77.7
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.093	0.091	0.092	0.091	93.9	94.6	8.5	38.7	76.6
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.062	0.062	0.062	0.062	94.6	94.7	28.6	41.9	79.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.074	0.073	0.073	0.072	95.1	94.8	17.9	41.4	80.1
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.118	0.118	0.112	0.109	94.3	94.9	2.3	28.9	70.9
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.156	0.155	0.149	0.143	93.4	93.8	1.6	29.1	70.4
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.093	0.097	0.089	0.092	95.7	95.9	6.8	30.5	73.9
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.116	0.115	0.109	0.108	94.7	94.7	4.0	30.4	73.9
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.088	0.089	0.086	0.087	95.5	96.2	7.9	24.6	68.0
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.114	0.114	0.110	0.111	93.3	94.5	2.6	24.5	65.3
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.080	0.080	0.078	0.077	95.1	94.6	19.8	26.3	69.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.088	0.092	0.086	0.089	95.5	95.8	10.5	26.3	70.8

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 the true value of β_1 .

† Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

4.2 Further simulations

Here we describe some further simulations for different settings. Path diagrams for these models are shown in Figures A.1–A.2, and results in Tables A.1–A.25, in the supplementary appendix. The discussion is short, because we focus on results that extend or deviate from the conclusions from the first set of simulations in Section 4.1. The following situations are included here:

- *Observed covariate, latent response (simulation case B)*. Structural model is as in case A (equation 16), except that η_{i1} is replaced by an observed covariate X_i . Three distributions for X_i are used: $X_i \sim N(0, 1)$ [case B1], $X_i \sim 2 \text{Bernoulli}(0.5) - 1$ [B2], and $X_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ with shape $\alpha = 0.06$ and rate $\beta = 1$, scaled to have sample mean 0 and variance 1 [B3].
- *Latent covariate, observed response (case C)*. Structural model is as in case A, except that η_{i2} is replaced by an observed response which is here labelled Z_i . Two conditional distributions for Z_i given η_{1i} (i.e. distributions for ϵ_i) are considered, a normal distribution [case C1] and a skew-normal distribution (Azzalini and Capitanio, 2014) set to have a skewness coefficient of just under 1 [C2], with Z_i having marginal mean of 0 and marginal variance 1 in all settings.
- *Ordinal measurement items (case D)*. Structural model is the same as in case A, but each measurement item Y_{ikj} has 4 rather than 2 categories. Measurement models are again derived from a linear model for a latent continuous Y_{ijk}^* , here resulting in an ordinal logistic measurement model for each Y_{ijk} . Its loading parameter λ is set as in case A. The measurement intercepts are such that the marginal probabilities of the four categories of each Y_{ikj} are (0.25,0.25,0.25,0.25) when $R_Y^2 = 0.6$ and about (0.20,0.30,0.30,0.20) when $R_Y^2 = 0.4$ (these correspond to the setting $\pi_Y = 0.5$ in case A).
- *Three latent variables (case E)*. The structural model has two parts, $\eta_{2i} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \eta_{1i} + \epsilon_{2i}$ and $\eta_{3i} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \eta_{1i} + \beta_2 \eta_{2i} + \epsilon_{3i}$ for a further latent variable η_{3i} . The latent variables are each marginally distributed as $N(0, 1)$, and each measured by p separate binary items Y_{ikj} . We set $R_Y^2 = 0.4$ for both η_{2i} and η_{3i} . What we vary here is the relative sizes of the coefficients β_1 and β_2 , so that the proportion of the “indirect effect” of η_{1i} on η_{3i} via η_{2i} ($\alpha_1 \beta_2$) out of the “total effect” ($\beta_1 + \alpha_1 \beta_2$) is 0, 1/3 or 1/2. Here and for cases F and G we report simulation results for estimates of β_2 .
- *Measurement model with cross-loadings (case F)*. Structural model is the same as in case E. The difference is that the items Y_{i23} and Y_{i24} , which were previously measures of η_{2i} only, are here also measures of η_{1i} . The measurement loadings for Y_{i23} and Y_{i24} given η_{1i} have the same value λ as all other loadings in the measurement model. In step 1 of two-step estimation the measurement model for η_1 and η_2 was accordingly estimated for these variables together, including the cross-loadings.
- *Misspecified measurement model (case G)*. The data-generating model is as in case F, but the measurement model is estimated as for case E, i.e. incorrectly omitting the cross-loadings from η_{1i} to Y_{i23} and Y_{i24} .

Cases B and C include the same 48 parameter settings as in case A, but cases D–F omit some of them for simplicity. There we consider only settings with the smaller number of $p = 4$

measurement items for each latent variable, and balanced items probabilities with $\pi_Y = 0.5$. What is then left to vary are the strength of the measurement models (with $R_Y^2 = 0.4, 0.6$), strengths of the associations in the structural model (with $R_\eta^2 = 0, 0.2, 0.4$ in case D, and as described above for cases E–G), and sample sizes ($n = 200, 1000$). In case E we also included $n = 100$ to further examine the performance of the estimators in such small samples. The results are again based on 1000 simulated datasets in each setting.

Consider first some of the results for parameters of the measurement models. Supplementary Table A.1 shows simulation means of the estimated measurement loadings (λ_{kj}) and table A.2 means of the estimated measurement intercepts (τ_{kj}) from one-step estimation and step 1 of two-step estimation in simulation cases A, B2 and B3. These means are over both the 1000 simulations and all p or (in case A) $2p$ loadings or intercepts in the model. The true values of all loadings and intercepts are 1 and 0 respectively in each case. In case A these are results for maximum likelihood (ML) estimates of these parameters for correctly specified models, two one-trait models (for two-step estimation) or one two-trait model (for one-step estimation). They are, as expected, approximately unbiased when $n = 1000$. With the smaller sample size of $n = 200$, however, the estimates show some bias. The simulation medians (which are not shown) are even then very close to the true values, so the observed bias is entirely due to skewness of the sampling distributions of these estimates in small samples.

Measurement models in cases B2 and B3 are of interest because they are examples of the situation (as discussed at the end of Section 3.2) where step 1 of two-step estimation is distributionally misspecified because a non-normal covariate X induces a non-normal marginal distribution of a latent variable (here η_2). In contrast, the model for one-step estimation (and two-step when $R_\eta^2 = 0$) is correctly specified. Previous literature on misspecified latent trait models suggests that this should be a minor deviation in case B2, because the Bernoulli distribution of X implies a symmetric two-component mixture model for η_2 . Case B3 could be more difficult, because there the marginal distribution of η_2 is skewed. It has a skewness coefficient of about 0.7 when $R_\eta^2 = 0.2$ and about 2.0 (i.e. comparable to an exponential distribution) when $R_\eta^2 = 0.4$. However, the results do not show any new problems in either of these cases: two-step estimates still behave similarly with the one-step estimates. This is the case even though case B3 was designed to be so extreme that it should not really occur in practice: the observed X had a skewness coefficient of 8.2, which any data analyst would be likely to notice and address by taking a (log) transformation of X . It thus seems that it is difficult for a non-normal covariate to induce a serious bias in the estimated measurement parameters from two-step estimation. It should then be even more difficult for this to lead to bias in the estimated structural parameters from step 2 — which are the focus of interest — and this is indeed what we find below.

Consider then results for estimates of structural regression coefficients. First, in cases B1, C1, D, E and F (and B2 and B3 when $R_\eta^2 = 0$) the estimation model is correctly specified. These results (and those for the cases discussed below) are reported in supplementary Tables A.3–A.25. The broad conclusion is that most of these results are similar to the results in case A. Both estimates perform mostly well, and two-step estimates at least as well as one-step estimates. These conclusions are thus not substantially affected when the models are larger than in case A, in having ordinal items, more latent variables, or non-simple measurement models. This is unsurprising, given that the large-sample properties of the estimators (as discussed in Sections 3.2 and 3.4.1) should not be affected by the complexity of the model.

There are, however, some new findings in these cases. First, in case C1 the estimates perform very similarly even in the most difficult settings (where the two-step ones had some extreme values in case A). A possible explanation is that when the latent η_1 is only an explanatory variable, a weak estimated measurement model for it tends to attenuate rather than exaggerate the estimate of β_1 , preventing occasional extreme estimates. Second, in cases with three latent variables (E and F) there are several settings where the one-step estimates have a much larger bias and RMSE than the two-step estimates. This is due to occasional extreme values of the one-step estimates, as can be seen by observing that the MAEs and simulation medians (the latter are shown separately in Tables A.18 and A.21) are similar even in these settings. These extremes occur most prominently with the largest sample size ($n = 1000$), which shows that they are not due to poor small-sample behaviour. Instead, they indicate numerical difficulties with one-step estimation, and of the estimation algorithm failing to converge to (or near) the maximum likelihood estimate. The code for the simulation was set to increase the number of starting values for datasets where the initial settings were not enough, but here the procedure we used for this was not always sufficient. Thus we could probably have removed some of these extreme estimates by manually increasing the starting values further. However, we left them in the results because they illustrate another difference between the estimators, which is that the two-step approach is computationally substantially more manageable than the one-step one. For the two-step estimates there were also some numerical extreme values in cases E (with $n = 100$) and F, but for the estimated standard errors rather than point estimates of β_2 .

Even when one-step estimation converges without problems, it is more time-consuming; most of the computing time in these simulations was spent on it. It is likely that this is the most important practical difference between these two methods in large models, where one-step estimation quickly becomes more and more demanding.

In case E we also included a small sample size of $n = 100$, where asymptotic properties of the estimators are least appropriate. This would arguably be uncomfortably small for substantive applications of models of this type. Even here the estimators perform mostly similarly and mostly well, although inevitably less well than with larger samples, and again with some extreme estimates. The two-step estimates have consistently the smaller RMSEs and MAEs, suggesting that they may have somewhat better properties in very small samples.

Consider then cases where the estimation model is misspecified in some way (B2, B3, C2, and G). There is essentially no difference between C2 and C1, suggesting that misspecification of the distribution of an observed response Z is inconsequential. In cases B2 and B3 there is misspecification in step 1 of two-step estimation, because the distribution of the covariate X is not normal. As discussed above, estimated measurement models were nevertheless not seriously affected. It follows that two-step estimates of the structural regression coefficient are also unaffected. They still behave similarly to one-step estimates, for which this model is correctly specified. In case B2 the results are essentially similar to the correctly specified B1. In case B3 the estimates are noticeably biased, at least with $n = 200$. This, however, affects both estimates — and is indeed worse for one-step estimates — so it is not due to the distributional misspecification in two-step estimation. Instead, it must be caused by the extreme skewness of X , which hurts the small-sample performance of both estimates.

Finally, in case F the estimation model is misspecified for both estimators. Both of them give biased estimates of all the structural coefficients in this case, with β_2 being overestimated. The bias is noticeably smaller for two-step estimators, but still substantial. This is not surprising.

Two-step estimation may reduce bias in estimated *parameters* of the measurement models because of the way it estimates them separately, but it still uses the same misspecified *form* of the model (i.e. of which items measure which latent variables). So we would not in general expect it to offer much additional protection against bias from model misspecification.

The conclusions from these simulations are broadly similar to previous ones for other types of models by Bakk and Kuha (2018) and Rosseel and Loh (2022). In all of these contexts two-step and one-step estimates mostly perform very similarly. Differences between them emerge in difficult situations where the measurement models are weak and sample sizes are small. Here there is some variation between the findings of the different studies. In the latent class examples of Bakk and Kuha (2018), two-step estimation does relatively poorly in difficult settings, possibly because an observed covariate or response provides particularly useful stabilisation for one-step estimates there. In contrast, in the simulations of structural equation models by Rosseel and Loh (2022) it is one-step estimation that performs much less well in the most difficult settings. In our simulations the differences in the hardest situations were somewhat smaller than in these previous studies. It should be noted that the exact simulation settings are not easily comparable. For example, Rosseel and Loh (2022) considered models with even more latent factors (five rather than three), which may be particularly challenging for the small-sample performance of one-step estimation (it would also be computationally very demanding for it for latent trait models). They also considered various cases where the analysis models were misspecified. The conclusions were qualitatively the same as in our simulations, i.e. that both estimates were then biased but the two-step estimates often somewhat less so.

4.3 Comments on three-step estimates in the simulations

The simulation tables include also results for naive three-step estimates which replace the latent variables η_{ik} with their empirical Bayes predictions $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$. They are typically badly biased for the true structural parameters. This to be expected, based on the general results discussed in Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3. These naive estimates are clearly an inadequate way of estimating the structural model for η_{ik} . As discussed in Section 3.4.2, it is more constructive to regard them as estimates for a model for $\tilde{\eta}_{ik}$, treated as a model of interest in its own right.

An exception here is case C, where the only latent variable η_1 appears as the only explanatory variable in the model. As observed in Section 3.4.3, naive three-step estimation which uses the empirical Bayes predictions then becomes a form of adjusted three-step estimation which avoids measurement error bias. Accordingly, estimates of β_1 in cases C1 and C2 are essentially unbiased and very similar to the two-step and one-step estimates (see supplementary Tables A.11 and A.13). This is not the case for the other simulations here, and generalising this type of adjustment to them would not be as easy.

The three-step estimates perform relatively well in case G, where the estimation model is misspecified because of omitted cross-loadings and where two-step and one-step estimates are clearly biased. The naive three-step estimates avoid this misspecification bias. This is because they *only* require valid estimates of the measurement models for each latent variable individually, and those are here correctly estimated (even though it includes cross-loadings, the model in case G (see supplementary Figure A.2) implies also a one-trait model for Y_{21} – Y_{24} given η_2). However, the three-step estimates still have their usual measurement error bias in this case.

5 Application: Extrinsic and intrinsic work values

Here we apply the methods to a real-data example. We use it, in particular, to further explore two topics which were not the focus of the simulations in Section 4: the possibility of interpretative confounding and computational demands of the different estimators.

The example concerns individuals’ *work value orientations*, conceptualised in two dimensions: intrinsic and extrinsic work values (for more information about substantive research in this area, see for example Gesthuizen et al. (2019) and Bacher et al. (2022), and references cited therein). We use data from the fifth wave of the European Values Study (EVS), conducted in 2017–20 (EVS, 2022). The survey includes six items on work values, introduced (in the English-language version) by *Here are some aspects of a job that people say are important. Please look at them and tell me which ones you personally think are important in a job?* The responses are binary, coded as 1 if the respondent mentioned that aspect and 0 if they did not (and with “Don’t know” responses coded as missing). Three of the items are treated as measures of extrinsic work values — “Good pay” (labelled *Pay* in the tables below), “Good hours” (*Hours*), and “Generous holidays” (*Holidays*) — and three of intrinsic work values — “An opportunity to use initiative” (*Initiative*), “A job in which you feel you can achieve something” (*Achievement*), and “A responsible job” (*Responsibility*). For more discussion of the measurement of work values in the EVS, see Gesthuizen et al. (2019).

To provide a focus for this illustrative application, we consider specifically gender differences in work value orientations between men and women (in EVS, gender is coded as a binary variable). This question was also examined, for example, by Bacher et al. (2022), using data for Austria from a different survey (The Social Survey of Austria).

We carry out two analyses. The second of them will be a cross-sectional analysis of all 36 countries in the EVS data. But first we consider just one country, the Netherlands. In addition to the work value items and gender, a set of covariates are included: the respondent’s age (in categories: 15–29, 30–49 or 50+ years), whether they are in a registered partnership and/or live with a partner (yes/no), the age of the youngest person in the household (0–5, 6–17, or older), respondent’s highest level of education (less than upper secondary, upper secondary, or higher), occupation-based social class (European Socioeconomic Classification [ESeC08]; grouped by type of employment regulation of the occupation as Service relationship [ESeC08 classes 1,2], Mixed [3,6], Labour contract [7,8,9] or Self-employed [4,5]), whether they are currently in paid employment (yes/no), and the highest education level of the respondent’s parents (coded as for own education). These parallel, as far as possible with the EVS data, the covariates used by Bacher et al. (2022). This analysis dataset for the Netherlands includes $n = 1374$ respondents with observed values of all the covariates and at least one of the six value items.

In the notation of Section 2, we consider here the structural model $p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)}|\mathbf{X}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{21})$ where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i(1)} = (\eta_{i1}, \eta_{i2})'$ and η_{i1} stands for extrinsic and η_{i2} for intrinsic work values. They are responses to covariates \mathbf{X}_i , and there are no observed response variables. As defined in (3), the model includes separate linear models for η_{i1} and η_{i2} , plus their conditional association which we report as the correlation $\rho = \text{corr}(\eta_{i1}, \eta_{i2}|\mathbf{X}_i)$. The two latent variables are measured by the corresponding 3 items each, with logistic measurement models (8).

Table 3: Models for extrinsic and intrinsic work values given gender, controlling for different sets of covariates, estimated from EVS2017 data for Netherlands. The table shows two-step (“2-st.”), one-step (“1-st.”) and naive three-step (“3-st.”) estimates. “Step 1” denotes the estimated measurement loadings from step 1 of two-step estimation, which are used for two-step and (for latent trait scores of) three-step estimation of all three models.

	Step 1	Model (1)*			Model (2)*			Model (3)*		
		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.
<i>Model for Extrinsic work values</i>										
Measurement loadings:										
<i>Pay</i>	1.000	1.000			1.000			1.000		
<i>Hours</i>	1.161	1.101			1.148			1.190		
<i>Holidays</i>	3.080	3.123			2.586			2.573		
Structural model: coefficient of Gender (man)										
Male		-0.042	-0.033	-0.033	0.025	0.022	0.024	0.018	0.009	0.018
(s.e.)		(0.103)	(0.104)	(0.082)	(0.101)	(0.104)	(0.080)	(0.102)	(0.104)	(0.081)
<i>Model for Intrinsic work values</i>										
Measurement loadings:										
<i>Initiative</i>	1.000	1.000			1.000			1.000		
<i>Achievement</i>	0.431	0.453			0.500			0.556		
<i>Responsibility</i>	0.563	0.589			0.631			0.804		
Structural model: coefficient of Gender (man)										
Male		0.607	0.603	0.460	0.657	0.638	0.500	0.516	0.506	0.400
(s.e.)		(0.193)	(0.186)	(0.142)	(0.194)	(0.176)	(0.142)	(0.188)	(0.151)	(0.139)
<i>Correlation of Extrinsic and Intrinsic work values given covariates</i>										
		0.550	0.551	0.345	0.543	0.549	0.334	0.559	0.567	0.334

* Model (1) includes only gender as covariate, Model (2) also respondent’s age, partnership status and age of the youngest person in the household, and Model (3) also respondent’s education, social class and work status, and their parents’ education.

The full sets of estimated coefficients of the structural model are shown in the supplementary appendix.

We consider three models, with different sets of covariates: Model (1) which includes only gender, Model (2) which adds respondent’s age, partnership status and age of the youngest person in the household, and Model (3) which includes all the covariates. Estimates are shown in Table 3. This includes only the loading parameters (λ_{kj}) of the measurement models, the regression coefficient of gender (as dummy variable for men) and the conditional correlation ρ . The full sets of structural coefficients are shown in supplementary Tables B.1 and B.2.

Consider first the estimated measurement models in Table 3. The column “Step 1” shows the measurement loadings that are obtained from step 1 of the two-step method. The measurement parameters from it are used for step 2 for all choices of the set of covariates \mathbf{X}_i . They are also used to calculate the trait scores that are used for three-step estimation of all the models.

In contrast, the one-step method estimates the measurement model anew whenever the structural model changes; these estimated loadings are shown under the “1-st.” columns of the table. This raises the possibility of interpretational confounding, where the definition of a latent variable is affected not only by its indicators but also by its predictors. Previously, Bakk and Kuha (2018) examined this for latent class models. In one of their examples, different choices of covariates flipped the measurement model between two qualitatively quite different configurations of the classes, so that comparisons of one-step estimates between different structural models


became effectively meaningless. The differences are not similarly dramatic in our example here. All of the one-step estimates of the loadings are positive, indicating that for both the extrinsic and intrinsic factors higher values correspond to a respondent placing higher importance on that dimension of work values, and the loadings of different items are in the same order of size in each case. This is perhaps not surprising, in that we might expect that for continuous latent variables such changes in the measurement model will be quantitative shifts rather than qualitative jumps. Nevertheless, in this more subtle way the one-step estimates for the three models in Table 3 are still for three slightly different response variables which differ both from each other and from the response in all of the two-step estimates.

Consider then the estimated structural models for the Netherlands. In terms of the settings of the simulations in Section 4, these data have $n = 1374$ and R_{η}^2 around 0.1 for both latent factors, each of them measured by $p = 3$ items with R_Y^2 of around 0.3–0.8 and π_Y of 0.4–0.7 (different for different items). These place this example around the middle of the simulation settings in terms of the strength of the measurement model, but with a somewhat larger sample size than even the larger $n = 1000$ considered there. The simulations suggest that the two-step and one-step estimates should both behave well here. They are also similar to each other, with somewhat higher standard errors for the two-step estimates. For the naive three-step estimates, for better comparability we first re-scaled the factor scores so that their variances equal the estimated marginal variances of the corresponding latent variables from step 1 of two-step estimation. Even after this, the three-step estimates of regression coefficients are attenuated toward zero, as would be expected given the theoretical and simulation results above.

Substantively, the results in Table 3 show that individuals’ intrinsic and extrinsic work values, as measured by these survey items, are strongly positively correlated even given covariates. Between genders, there is essentially no difference in extrinsic values, but for intrinsic ones men indicate on average significantly (at the 5% level) higher level of importance on them. Some other significant associations with covariates are also found, as shown by the estimated coefficients in supplementary Tables B.1 and B.2. The importance of extrinsic rewards of a job (pay, hours and holidays) tends to be higher for respondents who are younger, have young children at home, or are currently in paid employment. For intrinsic values (related to the scope of initiative, achievement and responsibility), the expected levels are higher for individuals who have (or whose parents have) higher levels education and who are in professional, administrative or managerial occupations.

Summarising previous literature on gender differences in work values, Bacher et al. (2022) observed that “[...]intrinsic work values, especially altruistic or social work values, seem still to be more important for women than men, at least in some countries and/or in combination with other factors[...]” and that “Gender differences in extrinsic work value orientations are absent or smaller than those for intrinsic work value orientations”. In their own analysis in Austria, they also found higher levels of intrinsic values for women. Our conclusion from the Netherlands is the opposite. This may be because the three intrinsic items in EVS do not include ones of “altruistic or social work” kind. But it could also be an instance of variation between different country contexts. To examine this further, we can use the EVS to carry out a comparative cross-national analysis. Here we include as covariates the respondents’ gender, age, education, social class and work status; the other covariates were omitted from this illustrative example because they had large proportions of missing data in some countries. The list of the 36 countries and their sample sizes in this analysis are shown in Tables B.3 and B.4 of the supplementary appendix.

Figure 1: Estimates of the coefficient (with 95% confidence intervals) of dummy variable for men in models for intrinsic work values (circles and solid lines) and extrinsic work values (triangles and dashed lines). Two-step estimates obtained separately for each country in the 2017 European Values Survey, but with the same measurement model for each country estimated from pooled data in step 1.



Note: The coefficients are expressed on a scale where the residual variance of both factors for the Netherlands is 1. The models also include as covariates the respondent's age, education, social class and employment status (working vs. not).

We allow all parameters of the structural model (regression coefficients and residual variances and covariance) to have different values in each country. Every parameter of the measurement model, in contrast, is constrained to have the same value in all countries, to specify full measurement equivalence across the countries. We note that because the step-1 estimates are here based on much more data than the step-2 estimates (with nearly 59,000 observations in the pooled data but 1000–2000 in each country), step 1 contributes essentially nothing to the standard errors of the estimated structural coefficients. So in this example we could safely treat the measurement parameters from step 1 as known and omit the term for them from the estimated standard errors.

Estimates of gender differences in the work values in each country are shown in supplementary Tables B.3 and B.4. We focus here on the two-step estimates, which are also shown in Figure 1. For extrinsic values, most of the point estimates indicate higher average importance of them for women, but these differences are small and mostly not statistically significant (at the 5% level). For intrinsic values there are a few more countries with significant differences, but they include ones in both directions and have no very clear geographic regularities in the variation

across countries. In other words, these results do not show strong evidence of consistent gender differences in work value orientations, suggesting at best small differences with much cross-national variation in them.

As mentioned at the start of this section, this application example also allowed us to examine two topics in the relative performance of two-step estimation. From the analysis for the Netherlands above, we discussed the observed level of interpretative confounding in one-step estimates. The second, cross-national analysis provides an extreme illustration of the difference in computational convenience between two- and one-step estimation. The model has 836 estimable parameters. One-step estimates have to be calculated for all of them at once, from the pooled dataset of all the countries. On our computer this took 4.5 hours, using just one starting value. Two-step estimation, in contrast, splits the task in a way which considerably simplifies it. In its step 1, the measurement models are estimated from the pooled dataset, as two one-trait models for three binary items each and without any covariates. Step 2 can then be done separately for each country, because their structural parameters are distinct. Even with multiple starting values (`Starts=30 10` in Mplus syntax) this took just 1-2 minutes for both step 1 and each country in step 2, for a total of a little over 0.5 hours for the whole model.

6 Conclusions and discussion

Two-step estimation is a general approach which is in principle applicable to any types of latent variable models where the focus of interest is on the structural model. In this paper we have described it for the broad family of latent trait (or item response theory) models, where continuous latent variables are measured by observed categorical indicators. In our simulations and examples, two-step estimation performed very well for them, as was also expected on theoretical grounds. We compared it with one-step estimation which estimates all model parameters at once (another possible alternative, adjusted three-step estimation, is not generally available for latent trait models). The two approaches behaved generally similarly, with two-step estimates losing next to no efficiency in large samples and often having somewhat better properties in small samples. This is in line with previous findings on two-step estimation for other families of models, in particular latent class analysis of categorical variables and structural equation modelling of continuous variables. Together these studies provide increasingly strong evidence and reassurance that the two-step method is a useful and convenient approach to estimation of latent variable models, and an attractive alternative to the existing one-step and three-step methods.

We also argue that two-step estimation has two major advantages in general. One of them is practical and computational convenience, compared to one-step estimation of all parts of the model at once. This may be particularly important for latent trait models, because they are more often used with complex structural models than are latent class models, and are also inherently more computationally demanding than structural equation models. Another important characteristic of the two-step approach is that it avoids interpretational confounding, where the effective definition of the latent variables is affected by the specification of the structural model. This may be more consequential for latent class models, where the interpretation of a categorical latent class variable can change in a discontinuous way, than for latent trait models and structural equation models which have continuous latent variables.

To build on these promising results so far, different directions of further research on different elements of two-step estimation could be pursued. The accessibility of the approach would be much improved by integrated implementation of it (including calculation of correct standard errors of the estimates) in general-purpose software for latent variable models, including latent trait models. This would extend and complement the procedures that are already available for latent class and structural equation modelling. For better understanding of the scope of two-step estimation, its implementation and performance could be studied for other categories of models, for example ones which combine different types of latent variables and measurement items, or for extensions such as multilevel models and ones with non-equivalent measurement models. These and other areas of further research remain to be explored.

Declarations

Funding: No funding was received for conducting this study.

Competing interests: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

References

- Azzalini, A. and A. Capitanio (2014). *The Skew-Normal and Related Families*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bacher, J., M. Beham-Rabanser, and M. Forstner (2022). Can work value orientations explain the gender wage gap in Austria? *International Journal of Sociology* 52, 208–228.
- Bakk, Z. and J. Kuha (2018). Two-step estimation of models between latent classes and external variables. *Psychometrika* 83, 871–892.
- Bakk, Z., F. T. Tekle, and J. K. Vermunt (2013). Estimating the association between latent class membership and external variables using bias-adjusted three-step approaches. *Sociological Methodology* 43, 272–311.
- Bandeen-Roche, K., D. L. Miglioretti, S. L. Zeger, and P. J. Rathouz (1997). Latent variable regression for multiple discrete outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92, 1375–1386.
- Bolck, A., M. Croon, and J. Hagenaars (2004). Estimating latent structure models with categorical variables: One-step versus three-step estimators. *Political Analysis* 12, 3–27.
- Burt, R. S. (1973). Confirmatory factor-analytic structures and the theory construction process. *Sociological Methods & Research* 2, 131–190.
- Burt, R. S. (1976). Interpretational confounding of unobserved variables in structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research* 5, 3–52.
- Cameron, A. C. and P. K. Trivedi (2005). *Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, R. J., D. Ruppert, L. A. Stefanski, and C. M. Crainiceanu (2006). *Measurement Error in Nonlinear Models* (Second ed.). Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.

- Croon, M. (2002). Using predicted latent scores in general latent structure models. In G. Marcoulides and I. Moustaki (Eds.), *Latent Variable and Latent Structure Models*, pp. 195–224. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Devlieger, I. and Y. Rosseel (2017). Factor score path analysis. *Methodology* 13(Supplement 1), 31–38.
- Di Mari, R. and Z. Bakk (2018). Mostly harmless direct effects: A comparison of different latent Markov modeling approaches. *Structural Equation Modeling* 25, 467–483.
- Di Mari, R., Z. Bakk, J. Oser, and J. Kuha (2023). A two-step estimator for multilevel latent class analysis with covariates. *Psychometrika* 88, 1144–1170.
- EVS (2022). European Values Study 2017: Integrated dataset (EVS 2017). GESIS, Cologne. ZA7500 Data file Version 5.0.0, <https://doi.org/10.4232/1.13897>.
- Gesthuizen, M., D. Kovarek, and C. Rapp (2019). Extrinsic and intrinsic work values: Findings on equivalence in different cultural contexts. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 682, 60–83.
- Gong, G. and F. J. Samaniego (1981). Pseudo maximum likelihood estimation: Theory and applications. *Annals of Statistics* 9(4), 861–869.
- Hallquist, M. N. and J. F. Wiley (2018). MplusAutomation: An R package for facilitating large-scale latent variable analyses in Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling* 25, 621–638.
- Horner, J. (2011). *brew: Templating Framework for Report Generation*. R package version 1.0-6.
- Janssen, J. H. M., S. van Laar, M. J. de Rooij, J. Kuha, and Z. Bakk (2019). The detection and modeling of direct effects in latent class analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling* 26, 280–290.
- Lai, M. H. C. and Y.-Y. Hsiao (2022). Two-stage path analysis with definition variables: An alternative framework to account for measurement error. *Psychological Methods* 27, 568–588.
- Levy, R. (2023). Precluding interpretational confounding in factor analysis with a covariate or outcome via measurement and uncertainty preserving parametric modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling* 30, 719–736.
- Lu, I. R. R. and D. R. Thomas (2008). Avoiding and correcting bias in score-based latent variable regression with discrete manifest items. *Structural Equation Modeling* 15(3), 462–490.
- Manapat, P. D. and M. C. Edwards (2022). Examining the robustness of the graded response and 2-parameter logistic models to violations of construct normality. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 82, 967–988.
- Muthén, L. K. and B. O. Muthén (2010). *Mplus User’s Guide (Sixth Edition)*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- R Core Team (2022). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software* 48, 1–36.

- Rosseel, Y. and W. W. Loh (2022). A structural after measurement approach to structural equation modeling. *Psychological Methods*. Advance online publication. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/met0000503>.
- Savalei, V. (2018). A comparison of several approaches for controlling measurement error in small samples. *Psychological Methods* 24, 352–370.
- Skrondal, A. and J. Kuha (2012). Improved regression calibration. *Psychometrika* 77, 649–669.
- Skrondal, A. and P. Laake (2001). Regression among factor scores. *Psychometrika* 66(4), 563–575.
- Vermunt, J. K. (2010). Latent class modeling with covariates: Two improved three-step approaches. *Political Analysis* 18, 450–469.
- Vermunt, J. K. and J. Magidson (2021a). How to perform three-step latent class analysis in the presence of measurement non-invariance or differential item functioning. *Structural Equation Modeling* 28, 356–364.
- Vermunt, J. K. and J. Magidson (2021b). *Upgrade Manual for Latent GOLD Basic, Advanced, Syntax, and Choice Version 6.0*. Arlington, MA: Statistical Innovations Inc.
- Xue, Q.-L. and K. Bandeen-Roche (2002). Combining complete multivariate outcomes with incomplete covariate information: A latent class approach. *Biometrics* 58, 110–120.

Two-step estimation of latent trait models

Supplementary appendices

These supplementary materials provide the following information:

A Results of the simulations (Section 4 of the paper)

- Path diagrams that represent the cases that are considered in the simulations of Section 4 of the paper are shown in Figures A.1 and A.2:
 - Cases with 1 or 2 latent variables (simulation cases A–D) in Figure A.1.
 - Cases with 3 latent variables (simulation cases E–G) in Figure A.2.
- Results of the simulations for point estimates of measurement parameters in simulation cases A, B2 and B3 are given in Tables A.1 (for the measurement loadings) and A.2 (for the measurement intercepts):
- Results of the simulations for estimates of structural regression coefficients are given in Tables A.3–A.25:
 - Case A (latent covariate, latent response) in Tables A.2 (point estimates) and A.3 (standard errors and confidence intervals). These tables are also shown in Section 4 of the main paper, as Tables 1 and 2 respectively.
 - Case B1, B2 and B3 (observed covariate, latent response) in Tables A.5, A.7, and A.9 (point estimates) and A.6, A.8, and A.10 (standard errors and confidence intervals).
 - Cases C1 and C2 (latent covariate, observed response) in Tables A.11 and A.13 (point estimates) and A.12 and A.14 (standard errors and confidence intervals).
 - Case D (like case A, but with ordinal measurement items) in Tables A.15 (point estimates) and A.16 (standard errors and confidence intervals).
 - Case E (three latent variables) in in Tables A.17 (and with medians rather than means of the estimates in A.18) and A.19 (standard errors and confidence intervals).
 - Case F (like case E, but with cross-loadings in the measurement model) in in Tables A.20 (and with medians rather than means of the estimates in A.21) and A.22 (standard errors and confidence intervals).
 - Case G (misspecified model: true model as in case F, but estimation model as in case E) in in Tables A.23 (and with medians rather than means of the estimates in A.24) and A.25 (standard errors and confidence intervals).


B Results of the example (Section 5 of the paper)

Further results of the applied example discussed in Section 5 are given Tables B.1–B.4:


- Full sets of coefficients for the structural models for Netherlands in Tables B.1–B.2.
 - Of these, the results for the coefficient of the dummy variable for Male are also shown in Section 5, as part of Table 3.
- The list of countries in the cross-national analysis, their sample sizes, and estimated coefficients of the dummy variable for Male in each of them in Tables B.3–B.4.
 - Of these, the two-step estimates of the coefficients and their 95% confidence intervals are also displayed in Figure 1 in Section 5 (with the further standardisation that there the coefficients are expressed on a scale where the residual variance of both intrinsic and extrinsic values for the Netherlands is 1).

Figure A.1: Path diagrams representing cases A–D that are considered in the simulation studies of Section 4 of the paper. Here the dashed arrows represent the measurement model that is estimated in step 1 of two-step estimation, and the solid arrow the structural model (regression model for η_2 given η_1 , η_2 given X , or Z given η_1) that is estimated in its step 2.

Cases A and D: Latent covariate, latent response



Case B: Observed covariate, latent response



Case C: Latent covariate, observed response






Figure A.2: Path diagrams representing cases E–G that are considered in the simulation studies of Section 4 of the paper. Here the dashed and dotted arrows represent the measurement model that is estimated in step 1 of two-step estimation, and the solid arrows the structural model (regression models for η_2 given η_1 and for η_3 given (η_1, η_2)) that is estimated in its step 2.

Case E: Three-variable structural model



Cases F and G: Three-variable structural model, with cross-loadings



In Case G, estimated measurement model is misspecified in that it omits the measurement paths from η_1 to items Y_{23} and Y_{24} .

Table A.1: Simulation means of two-step and one-step point estimates of all loadings parameters (λ_{kj}) of the measurement models in simulation cases A, B2 and B3. In each case the true value of all the loadings is 1.

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	Case A		Case B2		Case B3	
				2-step	1-step	2-step	1-step	2-step	1-step
$n = 200$									
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	1.095	1.046	1.116	1.118	1.118	1.120
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.345	1.632	1.349	1.358	1.331	1.397
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	1.068	0.916	1.081	1.082	1.080	1.081
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.107	1.172	1.117	1.115	1.139	1.141
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	1.045	-0.597	1.035	1.036	1.049	1.049
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.089	1.096	1.071	1.071	1.079	1.080
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	1.031	-4.574	1.036	1.036	1.042	1.042
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.050	1.059	1.056	1.056	1.054	1.054
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.095	1.087	1.080	1.071	1.132	1.123
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	1.279	1.314	1.288	1.178	1.588	1.436
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	1.084	0.659	1.072	1.066	1.058	1.058
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	1.126	1.127	1.086	1.058	1.110	1.115
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.048	-0.662	1.055	1.050	1.038	1.039
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	1.088	1.090	1.101	1.091	1.105	1.106
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	1.028	-1.730	1.036	1.033	1.032	1.033
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	1.047	1.049	1.058	1.055	1.053	1.054
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.096	1.084	1.103	1.054	1.132	1.116
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.281	1.182	1.298	1.112	2.336	1.836
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.071	0.930	1.060	1.038	1.095	1.092
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.107	1.092	1.118	1.084	1.150	1.162
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.054	0.040	1.056	1.049	1.071	1.073
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.105	1.098	1.084	1.074	1.200	1.203
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.034	-2.222	1.037	1.032	1.029	1.031
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.055	1.055	1.046	1.044	1.066	1.067
$n = 1000$									
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	1.019	1.022	1.020	1.020	1.021	1.021
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.031	1.034	1.025	1.025	1.037	1.036
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	1.015	1.015	1.011	1.011	1.012	1.012
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.019	1.023	1.018	1.018	1.017	1.017
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	1.005	1.006	1.003	1.003	1.006	1.006
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.017	1.020	1.015	1.015	1.007	1.007
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	1.005	1.008	1.009	1.009	1.006	1.006
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.007	1.010	1.005	1.005	1.014	1.014
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.009	1.011	1.018	1.012	1.022	1.023
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	1.028	1.025	1.037	1.024	1.046	1.046
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	1.013	1.012	1.014	1.012	1.013	1.012
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	1.011	1.011	1.009	1.010	1.008	1.008
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.008	1.009	1.010	1.009	1.011	1.011
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	1.017	1.020	1.011	1.011	1.014	1.014
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	1.008	1.009	1.002	1.003	1.006	1.006
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	1.008	1.009	1.007	1.006	1.014	1.014
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.018	1.014	1.015	1.006	1.024	1.022
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.026	1.023	1.028	1.016	1.038	1.042
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.016	1.012	1.013	1.009	1.016	1.016
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.012	1.012	1.017	1.013	1.019	1.020
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.008	1.008	1.010	1.010	1.018	1.018
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.013	1.018	1.015	1.013	1.011	1.011
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.006	1.007	1.007	1.005	1.008	1.008
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.008	1.009	1.009	1.009	1.007	1.008

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j ,

π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, and

R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 .

Table A.2: Simulation means of two-step and one-step point estimates of all intercept parameters (τ_{kj}) of the measurement models in simulation cases A, B2 and B3. In each case the true value of all the intercepts is 0.

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	Case A		Case B2		Case B3	
				2-step	1-step	2-step	1-step	2-step	1-step
$n = 200$									
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	-0.013	-0.008	-0.002	-0.002	0.001	0.002
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.462	0.743	0.442	0.452	0.403	0.490
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.005	0.020	-0.003	-0.003	-0.001	-0.001
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.085	0.148	0.092	0.090	0.136	0.138
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.009	0.023	0.001	0.001	-0.006	-0.006
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.103	0.110	0.093	0.093	0.110	0.111
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	-0.006	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.007	0.007
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.036	0.045	0.046	0.046	0.061	0.061
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	-0.003	-0.004	0.002	0.000	-0.001	-0.004
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.339	0.348	0.349	0.215	0.847	0.548
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	-0.006	-0.014	-0.013	-0.013	0.003	0.001
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.097	0.099	0.058	0.035	0.104	0.105
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	-0.000	-0.005	0.005	0.005	-0.002	-0.002
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.109	0.111	0.132	0.118	0.146	0.147
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.005	-0.024	-0.010	-0.010	0.006	0.005
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.050	0.053	0.054	0.051	0.045	0.045
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	-0.002	-0.000	0.008	0.007	0.007	0.003
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.327	0.207	0.398	0.143	2.015	1.166
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.002	-0.002	0.014	0.014	-0.004	-0.009
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.094	0.074	0.099	0.062	0.129	0.139
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	-0.007	0.003	0.003	0.002	-0.004	-0.007
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.137	0.128	0.096	0.082	0.286	0.286
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.003	0.035	-0.010	-0.010	0.005	0.003
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.047	0.047	0.043	0.038	0.083	0.083
$n = 1000$									
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.045	0.048	0.035	0.034	0.047	0.046
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	-0.002	-0.002	0.000	0.000	-0.001	-0.001
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.016	0.019	0.006	0.006	0.012	0.013
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.003	-0.004	-0.004
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.020	0.023	0.018	0.018	0.012	0.012
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	-0.003	-0.003
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.004	0.007	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.020
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	-0.004	-0.004	0.002	0.002	0.000	-0.000
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.033	0.029	0.043	0.027	0.058	0.058
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	-0.002	-0.002	0.001	0.001	-0.003	-0.003
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.010	0.004	0.004
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.001	-0.000	-0.000
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.021	0.025	0.013	0.013	0.014	0.014
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.004	0.004	-0.004	-0.004	-0.003	-0.003
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.001	0.001	-0.007	-0.007	-0.003	-0.004
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.030	0.026	0.033	0.017	0.059	0.063
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	-0.003	-0.003	-0.005	-0.004	0.001	-0.000
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.007	0.008	0.016	0.012	0.019	0.019
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	-0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.001	0.005	0.004
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.018	0.023	0.014	0.012	0.017	0.017
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.001	0.001	0.006	0.006	-0.000	-0.000
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.006	0.007	0.002	0.002	0.009	0.009

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j ,

π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, and

R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 .

Table A.3: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed latent response η_2 (Case A).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.004	-0.003	-0.002	0.133	0.141	0.081	0.077	0.080	0.046
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.007	-0.004	-0.000	0.240	0.276	0.110	0.101	0.113	0.044
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.007	0.007	0.005	0.115	0.117	0.080	0.069	0.070	0.048
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.153	0.154	0.091	0.081	0.084	0.048
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.104	0.104	0.078	0.063	0.062	0.047
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.147	0.151	0.087	0.081	0.083	0.047
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.003	-0.003	-0.002	0.097	0.095	0.077	0.062	0.059	0.050
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.000	0.114	0.116	0.080	0.072	0.073	0.050
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.016	0.035	-0.162	0.236	0.237	0.221	0.132	0.132	0.202
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.031	0.070	-0.208	0.404	0.385	0.300	0.183	0.177	0.267
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.019	0.025	-0.116	0.182	0.189	0.176	0.117	0.116	0.148
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.030	0.039	-0.144	0.257	0.244	0.225	0.135	0.134	0.183
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.013	0.010	-0.104	0.177	0.188	0.170	0.109	0.110	0.137
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.023	0.040	-0.152	0.249	0.250	0.222	0.144	0.136	0.197
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.005	-0.008	-0.081	0.143	0.159	0.143	0.092	0.093	0.116
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.024	0.028	-0.100	0.183	0.181	0.170	0.114	0.111	0.137
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.028	0.047	-0.223	0.309	0.285	0.301	0.176	0.162	0.268
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.042	0.081	-0.284	0.608	0.457	0.436	0.228	0.199	0.363
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.048	0.052	-0.143	0.275	0.254	0.247	0.140	0.147	0.199
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.038	0.048	-0.195	0.326	0.283	0.295	0.174	0.161	0.255
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.020	0.022	-0.142	0.213	0.222	0.216	0.131	0.134	0.176
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.033	0.054	-0.204	0.344	0.346	0.309	0.177	0.166	0.258
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.033	0.006	-0.087	0.196	0.227	0.182	0.127	0.124	0.138
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.024	0.030	-0.138	0.223	0.218	0.220	0.137	0.135	0.180
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.054	0.032	0.036	0.036	0.021
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	0.072	0.073	0.032	0.049	0.049	0.021
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.045	0.045	0.031	0.030	0.030	0.021
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.054	0.055	0.032	0.036	0.036	0.021
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.045	0.045	0.033	0.031	0.031	0.023
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.059	0.059	0.034	0.038	0.038	0.022
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	0.040	0.040	0.032	0.026	0.026	0.021
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.045	0.045	0.032	0.030	0.030	0.021
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.006	0.012	-0.174	0.092	0.090	0.183	0.061	0.059	0.178
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.011	0.021	-0.227	0.124	0.124	0.236	0.078	0.077	0.234
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.001	0.003	-0.131	0.075	0.074	0.142	0.053	0.052	0.135
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.011	0.013	-0.160	0.091	0.090	0.171	0.057	0.059	0.168
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.004	0.005	-0.112	0.073	0.073	0.125	0.047	0.047	0.116
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.010	0.015	-0.163	0.094	0.093	0.174	0.062	0.061	0.166
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.002	0.003	-0.084	0.062	0.062	0.098	0.039	0.039	0.087
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.008	0.009	-0.113	0.074	0.074	0.126	0.048	0.048	0.118
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.009	0.014	-0.244	0.118	0.112	0.255	0.076	0.076	0.250
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.003	0.014	-0.319	0.156	0.150	0.329	0.103	0.099	0.329
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.006	0.007	-0.177	0.093	0.090	0.190	0.061	0.058	0.182
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.009	0.010	-0.218	0.117	0.109	0.232	0.074	0.071	0.223
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.003	0.005	-0.158	0.088	0.086	0.172	0.059	0.057	0.164
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	-0.001	0.007	-0.231	0.114	0.111	0.244	0.078	0.072	0.237
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.007	0.008	-0.110	0.080	0.079	0.128	0.054	0.053	0.112
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.006	0.008	-0.152	0.088	0.086	0.167	0.060	0.058	0.156

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Table A.4: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed latent response η_2 (Case A).

p	π_Y	$R_{Y_j}^2$	$R_{\eta_j}^2$	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)					
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.133	0.137	0.141	0.138	99.5	99.3	95.6	87.3	96.0
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.240	0.224	0.276	0.235	99.9	100.0	94.7	78.0	96.0
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.115	0.114	0.116	0.114	98.9	98.5	94.3	91.4	94.9
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.153	0.146	0.154	0.145	99.2	98.6	94.2	88.2	95.1
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.105	0.105	0.105	0.102	98.5	98.5	95.7	92.5	95.8
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.147	0.143	0.151	0.143	99.3	99.0	95.0	87.1	95.9
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.097	0.095	0.095	0.090	98.4	98.1	95.5	94.3	95.7
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.115	0.112	0.116	0.112	99.1	99.0	94.5	92.1	95.0
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.236	0.223	0.235	0.217	90.5	90.5	36.8	41.3	77.9
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.403	0.333	0.378	0.331	88.5	90.3	28.2	41.6	75.4
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.181	0.183	0.187	0.178	92.8	92.7	48.6	43.3	82.8
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.256	0.230	0.241	0.219	91.5	91.9	38.4	42.8	79.3
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.176	0.162	0.188	0.160	90.7	89.3	48.7	39.7	77.0
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.248	0.226	0.247	0.226	91.1	91.8	36.5	39.7	75.1
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.143	0.143	0.159	0.137	92.1	90.0	57.4	42.3	78.9
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.181	0.175	0.179	0.171	92.1	92.6	51.4	40.9	78.5
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.308	0.295	0.281	0.263	91.9	92.7	28.6	27.3	72.2
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.607	0.439	0.450	0.385	89.7	92.8	19.9	27.9	69.6
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.271	0.254	0.248	0.229	94.0	94.6	36.7	28.8	73.8
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.324	0.316	0.279	0.267	93.2	94.5	29.5	28.3	71.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.212	0.208	0.221	0.203	92.5	92.5	40.7	24.9	66.1
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.342	0.284	0.342	0.280	91.0	92.7	27.6	24.6	65.1
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.193	0.189	0.227	0.175	94.6	90.2	47.7	25.9	66.8
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.221	0.218	0.216	0.211	93.2	94.1	38.4	26.2	68.5
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.053	0.054	0.054	0.054	95.9	95.7	95.1	97.1	95.1
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.072	0.076	0.073	0.076	97.9	97.2	96.3	95.1	96.3
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.046	0.045	0.046	96.5	96.4	95.2	98.3	95.4
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.054	0.056	0.055	0.056	96.8	96.8	95.9	97.6	96.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.044	0.045	0.044	95.3	95.2	94.5	98.2	94.5
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.059	0.056	0.059	0.056	95.0	94.8	93.7	96.9	94.0
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.040	0.040	0.040	0.040	96.1	95.9	95.2	98.8	95.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.046	0.046	0.046	96.3	96.2	95.1	98.4	95.3
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.092	0.091	0.089	0.089	94.4	95.4	5.9	41.6	79.5
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.124	0.123	0.122	0.120	93.6	94.1	3.2	42.6	80.2
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.075	0.076	0.074	0.074	94.8	94.6	12.6	43.8	79.3
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.090	0.090	0.089	0.089	96.0	95.8	8.4	43.8	81.3
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.073	0.070	0.073	0.069	93.9	94.6	18.8	39.3	77.7
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.447	0.093	0.091	0.092	0.091	93.9	94.6	8.5	38.7	76.6
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.062	0.062	0.062	0.062	94.6	94.7	28.6	41.9	79.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.447	0.074	0.073	0.073	0.072	95.1	94.8	17.9	41.4	80.1
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.118	0.118	0.112	0.109	94.3	94.9	2.3	28.9	70.9
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.156	0.155	0.149	0.143	93.4	93.8	1.6	29.1	70.4
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.093	0.097	0.089	0.092	95.7	95.9	6.8	30.5	73.9
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.116	0.115	0.109	0.108	94.7	94.7	4.0	30.4	73.9
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.088	0.089	0.086	0.087	95.5	96.2	7.9	24.6	68.0
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.632	0.114	0.114	0.110	0.111	93.3	94.5	2.6	24.5	65.3
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.080	0.080	0.078	0.077	95.1	94.6	19.8	26.3	69.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.632	0.088	0.092	0.086	0.089	95.5	95.8	10.5	26.3	70.8

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

$R_{Y_j}^2$ and $R_{\eta_j}^2$ the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

† Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Table A.5: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a normally distributed covariate X for a latent response η_2 (Case B1) .

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.003	-0.004	-0.002	0.146	0.151	0.090	0.084	0.086	0.052
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.007	0.006	0.003	0.196	0.208	0.094	0.100	0.102	0.045
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.008	0.008	0.006	0.207	0.208	0.145	0.125	0.126	0.086
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.251	0.253	0.151	0.144	0.145	0.085
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.005	-0.005	-0.004	0.132	0.132	0.098	0.085	0.085	0.063
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.150	0.152	0.088	0.096	0.097	0.056
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.187	0.185	0.150	0.118	0.118	0.095
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.013	-0.013	-0.009	0.203	0.204	0.141	0.133	0.135	0.093
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.030	0.039	-0.239	0.251	0.229	0.292	0.137	0.132	0.267
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.065	0.054	-0.326	0.527	0.367	0.423	0.179	0.166	0.382
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.045	0.048	-0.270	0.320	0.300	0.355	0.182	0.176	0.319
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.085	0.071	-0.359	0.520	0.394	0.475	0.221	0.210	0.418
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.023	0.026	-0.153	0.183	0.180	0.208	0.119	0.115	0.175
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.031	0.040	-0.254	0.255	0.266	0.298	0.151	0.142	0.277
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.042	0.042	-0.163	0.256	0.253	0.262	0.161	0.162	0.205
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.052	0.056	-0.264	0.315	0.312	0.345	0.188	0.190	0.302
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.031	0.034	-0.348	0.305	0.251	0.401	0.185	0.148	0.382
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.143	0.074	-0.443	0.924	0.365	0.632	0.254	0.213	0.533
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.083	0.071	-0.367	0.404	0.364	0.466	0.233	0.207	0.412
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.093	0.075	-0.527	0.642	0.449	0.663	0.269	0.252	0.611
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.035	0.042	-0.216	0.234	0.233	0.280	0.136	0.131	0.245
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.040	0.051	-0.362	0.309	0.297	0.408	0.183	0.167	0.389
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.051	0.051	-0.239	0.317	0.316	0.351	0.198	0.197	0.286
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.051	0.054	-0.391	0.365	0.356	0.470	0.214	0.207	0.434
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.062	0.062	0.037	0.041	0.041	0.025
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.002	0.073	0.074	0.033	0.046	0.046	0.020
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.086	0.086	0.060	0.058	0.058	0.040
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.007	0.007	0.004	0.095	0.095	0.055	0.065	0.065	0.038
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.055	0.055	0.041	0.036	0.036	0.026
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.003	-0.003	-0.002	0.065	0.065	0.038	0.044	0.044	0.026
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.080	0.079	0.064	0.052	0.051	0.041
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	0.085	0.085	0.059	0.057	0.057	0.040
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	-0.004	-0.001	-0.268	0.098	0.092	0.276	0.063	0.059	0.273
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.009	0.014	-0.365	0.117	0.108	0.369	0.078	0.072	0.369
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.015	0.016	-0.292	0.127	0.123	0.307	0.084	0.079	0.300
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.006	0.007	-0.409	0.143	0.137	0.419	0.095	0.093	0.413
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.003	0.004	-0.171	0.077	0.076	0.181	0.054	0.052	0.174
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.003	0.003	-0.273	0.095	0.093	0.280	0.066	0.063	0.277
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	-0.001	-0.002	-0.199	0.108	0.108	0.218	0.072	0.073	0.201
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.001	0.001	-0.299	0.116	0.115	0.310	0.078	0.077	0.304
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.008	0.011	-0.371	0.123	0.107	0.380	0.080	0.070	0.378
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.012	0.014	-0.517	0.158	0.133	0.523	0.096	0.086	0.524
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.013	0.014	-0.420	0.157	0.151	0.436	0.099	0.097	0.426
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.011	0.011	-0.579	0.184	0.170	0.591	0.120	0.116	0.586
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.006	0.007	-0.241	0.097	0.093	0.252	0.062	0.060	0.243
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.009	0.010	-0.385	0.121	0.114	0.392	0.082	0.075	0.388
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.007	0.007	-0.275	0.125	0.123	0.293	0.079	0.079	0.278
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.020	0.018	-0.410	0.153	0.150	0.425	0.100	0.096	0.412

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Table A.6: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a normally distributed covariate X for a latent response η_2 (Case B1).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)					
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.146	0.149	0.151	0.149	98.4	98.0	95.3	92.6	95.3
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.196	0.204	0.208	0.201	99.2	98.1	94.8	86.5	95.0
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.207	0.205	0.208	0.204	96.1	95.8	93.2	95.2	93.4
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.251	0.240	0.253	0.243	97.4	96.8	94.0	92.8	94.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.132	0.129	0.132	0.129	96.8	96.8	95.3	95.6	95.3
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.150	0.150	0.152	0.150	98.2	98.0	95.1	92.6	95.0
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.187	0.186	0.185	0.185	95.4	95.6	94.2	96.8	94.3
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.203	0.202	0.203	0.202	96.5	96.2	94.7	95.9	94.7
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.250	0.240	0.226	0.218	94.1	95.4	27.5	40.4	80.9
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.523	0.386	0.363	0.301	92.3	93.7	13.5	34.6	73.7
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.317	0.310	0.296	0.294	95.9	96.1	38.1	46.6	83.3
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.513	0.400	0.387	0.351	93.4	93.8	25.4	44.6	79.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.182	0.181	0.178	0.178	95.7	95.8	47.6	45.3	82.6
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.253	0.232	0.263	0.227	94.9	94.7	26.0	39.3	76.2
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.252	0.252	0.250	0.249	95.3	95.3	61.4	51.0	85.2
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.310	0.289	0.307	0.285	95.5	95.6	42.1	47.5	80.6
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.303	0.297	0.249	0.243	94.7	96.3	17.5	24.3	66.0
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.913	0.566	0.357	0.323	94.0	95.4	8.3	20.3	61.8
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.396	0.393	0.357	0.347	96.6	96.8	26.9	30.6	75.4
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.635	0.636	0.442	0.407	93.7	94.6	14.5	28.6	71.2
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.231	0.223	0.229	0.214	96.1	94.7	29.9	27.3	71.5
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.307	0.291	0.293	0.270	94.4	95.0	13.9	23.2	67.2
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.313	0.300	0.312	0.294	95.2	95.0	43.0	32.3	74.0
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.361	0.349	0.352	0.337	95.9	95.8	22.8	30.3	72.7
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.062	0.061	0.062	0.061	95.4	95.3	94.3	98.4	94.3
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.073	0.072	0.074	0.072	95.5	95.2	94.8	97.3	94.8
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.086	0.086	0.086	0.086	95.5	95.4	95.0	99.1	95.2
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.095	0.093	0.095	0.093	95.1	95.0	94.7	98.7	94.9
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.055	0.055	0.055	0.055	94.7	94.6	94.4	99.1	94.4
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.065	0.062	0.065	0.062	95.4	95.2	94.2	98.4	94.3
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.080	0.079	0.079	0.079	95.0	95.2	94.8	99.4	94.9
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	95.4	95.2	94.9	99.2	95.2
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.098	0.094	0.092	0.089	93.9	94.0	0.8	41.8	76.7
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.117	0.121	0.107	0.112	95.9	96.1	0.0	36.5	77.8
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.127	0.125	0.122	0.122	95.0	95.7	3.8	47.7	81.9
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.143	0.142	0.137	0.138	94.7	95.0	0.4	45.6	81.4
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.077	0.078	0.076	0.077	94.6	95.6	7.0	45.9	81.7
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.095	0.095	0.093	0.093	95.2	95.0	0.1	40.4	78.7
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.108	0.106	0.108	0.105	93.4	93.5	17.8	51.4	82.5
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.116	0.119	0.115	0.119	96.6	96.4	2.5	48.7	83.4
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.122	0.119	0.107	0.104	94.0	94.3	0.2	25.7	67.3
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.158	0.155	0.133	0.128	95.3	94.8	0.0	22.4	65.3
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.157	0.155	0.150	0.144	94.4	94.1	1.4	31.5	75.2
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.184	0.178	0.170	0.164	95.3	94.1	0.1	30.2	69.4
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.096	0.095	0.093	0.092	94.8	95.0	2.1	27.5	69.4
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.121	0.120	0.114	0.113	95.2	96.0	0.1	24.0	66.8
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.124	0.128	0.123	0.126	94.3	94.2	6.3	32.7	75.6
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.152	0.148	0.149	0.144	95.5	95.2	1.3	30.8	72.1

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

† Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Table A.7: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a binary covariate X for a latent response η_2 (Case B2).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.144	0.147	0.090	0.090	0.092	0.055
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.007	0.008	0.003	0.191	0.213	0.091	0.099	0.106	0.046
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001	0.209	0.210	0.147	0.129	0.129	0.091
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.259	0.254	0.160	0.138	0.141	0.081
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	0.125	0.126	0.093	0.086	0.086	0.063
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.004	0.005	0.003	0.160	0.162	0.095	0.091	0.092	0.053
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.005	-0.005	-0.004	0.185	0.184	0.149	0.126	0.126	0.100
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.003	0.204	0.206	0.143	0.135	0.135	0.094
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.016	0.026	-0.231	0.236	0.221	0.285	0.138	0.135	0.261
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.077	0.050	-0.318	0.567	0.316	0.439	0.194	0.171	0.383
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.035	0.037	-0.236	0.299	0.297	0.332	0.191	0.182	0.290
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.082	0.083	-0.345	0.465	0.428	0.444	0.218	0.211	0.393
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.021	0.023	-0.137	0.192	0.189	0.208	0.126	0.124	0.169
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.018	0.026	-0.257	0.239	0.232	0.298	0.147	0.140	0.277
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.044	0.044	-0.123	0.256	0.255	0.254	0.157	0.158	0.191
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.046	0.048	-0.248	0.309	0.303	0.336	0.180	0.178	0.290
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.042	0.039	-0.280	0.308	0.236	0.361	0.171	0.156	0.323
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.062	0.065	-0.479	0.587	0.388	0.563	0.234	0.182	0.525
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.050	0.045	-0.254	0.398	0.351	0.425	0.223	0.198	0.337
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.079	0.072	-0.495	0.508	0.505	0.594	0.253	0.241	0.558
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.015	0.018	-0.175	0.217	0.208	0.255	0.137	0.131	0.204
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.025	0.037	-0.361	0.290	0.279	0.406	0.181	0.164	0.381
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.047	0.044	-0.114	0.321	0.308	0.320	0.185	0.175	0.229
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.070	0.071	-0.318	0.359	0.352	0.419	0.216	0.213	0.365
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.061	0.062	0.037	0.040	0.040	0.024
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.074	0.032	0.046	0.046	0.020
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	0.082	0.083	0.058	0.055	0.056	0.039
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.094	0.094	0.055	0.060	0.060	0.035
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.056	0.056	0.042	0.037	0.037	0.027
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.064	0.064	0.037	0.044	0.043	0.025
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	0.081	0.081	0.065	0.056	0.055	0.045
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.087	0.087	0.061	0.055	0.055	0.038
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.004	0.005	-0.249	0.093	0.086	0.257	0.058	0.055	0.253
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.001	0.009	-0.366	0.128	0.114	0.371	0.081	0.072	0.370
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.008	0.011	-0.261	0.118	0.118	0.278	0.077	0.078	0.263
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	-0.002	-0.001	-0.401	0.145	0.140	0.412	0.093	0.093	0.408
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.007	0.007	-0.152	0.079	0.078	0.165	0.053	0.052	0.156
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.008	0.009	-0.266	0.096	0.094	0.273	0.061	0.059	0.268
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.003	0.002	-0.161	0.109	0.109	0.187	0.069	0.070	0.164
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.008	0.009	-0.276	0.118	0.118	0.290	0.082	0.079	0.279
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.001	0.005	-0.322	0.119	0.103	0.334	0.077	0.069	0.330
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.005	0.011	-0.520	0.165	0.131	0.526	0.105	0.085	0.525
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.007	0.012	-0.296	0.154	0.141	0.325	0.105	0.097	0.308
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.023	0.020	-0.531	0.182	0.166	0.545	0.122	0.102	0.541
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.001	0.003	-0.191	0.095	0.089	0.208	0.062	0.057	0.194
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.006	0.010	-0.376	0.114	0.111	0.383	0.072	0.072	0.377
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.014	0.014	-0.148	0.129	0.124	0.191	0.085	0.083	0.161
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.007	0.005	-0.364	0.148	0.143	0.382	0.097	0.094	0.372

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Table A.8: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a binary covariate X for a latent response η_2 (Case B2).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]		
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.	
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)						
$n = 200$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.144	0.147	0.147	0.147	97.9	97.7	95.5	92.7	95.6	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.191	0.239	0.213	0.214	99.2	98.8	94.4	85.2	94.7	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.209	0.204	0.210	0.204	95.8	95.6	93.7	95.2	93.7	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.260	0.243	0.254	0.243	97.5	97.3	94.1	92.9	94.4	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.126	0.129	0.126	0.129	97.1	97.1	96.0	95.8	96.0	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.160	0.151	0.162	0.151	98.4	98.1	96.4	93.2	96.3	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.185	0.185	0.184	0.184	96.5	96.5	95.3	96.9	95.4	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.204	0.201	0.206	0.201	96.9	96.8	94.7	95.7	94.8	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.235	0.228	0.219	0.209	94.2	94.0	27.6	38.6	76.3	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.562	0.486	0.312	0.288	93.3	94.1	13.7	33.8	73.1	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.297	0.296	0.295	0.285	94.4	94.5	44.1	45.9	82.1	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.459	0.378	0.420	0.354	94.3	95.5	27.6	42.9	80.2	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.191	0.178	0.188	0.174	93.2	93.5	51.0	44.3	78.5	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.239	0.226	0.231	0.218	92.8	93.1	25.0	38.7	74.9	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.252	0.247	0.251	0.244	95.2	95.2	64.9	49.3	83.5	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.305	0.285	0.299	0.281	95.1	95.0	42.1	46.5	79.6	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.305	0.297	0.233	0.230	95.0	95.6	21.5	22.6	66.7	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.584	0.444	0.382	0.349	93.1	95.8	6.5	20.5	63.2	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.395	0.372	0.348	0.322	94.8	94.4	34.0	28.1	69.8	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.502	0.470	0.501	0.402	94.6	94.1	15.6	27.8	72.1	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.217	0.213	0.207	0.201	94.6	93.9	38.1	26.0	68.0	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.289	0.285	0.277	0.265	94.8	94.9	14.8	22.3	64.9	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.318	0.294	0.305	0.281	94.6	94.7	51.7	29.7	70.7	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.352	0.348	0.345	0.335	96.6	96.3	32.8	28.5	72.4	
$n = 1000$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.061	0.061	0.062	0.061	94.9	94.6	93.8	98.5	93.9	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.073	0.073	0.074	0.073	95.2	95.0	94.4	97.2	94.4	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.082	0.086	0.083	0.085	95.9	95.9	95.8	99.1	95.9	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.094	0.093	0.094	0.093	94.6	94.6	94.4	98.7	94.4	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.056	0.055	0.056	0.055	94.3	94.4	94.1	99.1	94.2	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.064	0.062	0.064	0.062	95.7	95.7	95.1	98.5	95.1	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.081	0.079	0.081	0.079	95.1	95.6	94.8	99.3	94.7	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.087	0.085	0.087	0.085	94.1	94.0	93.6	99.2	93.6	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.093	0.094	0.085	0.088	95.4	95.8	1.7	40.3	79.2	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.128	0.120	0.114	0.111	92.4	93.9	0.0	36.9	73.4	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.118	0.122	0.118	0.119	95.8	95.1	7.1	46.3	83.8	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.145	0.140	0.140	0.135	93.8	94.5	0.7	44.8	79.3	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.079	0.077	0.078	0.076	93.9	93.8	13.8	44.8	79.3	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.096	0.095	0.094	0.093	94.8	94.6	0.7	39.8	79.0	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.109	0.105	0.109	0.104	93.7	93.2	31.0	50.3	80.7	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.118	0.119	0.117	0.118	95.7	95.5	4.3	47.2	82.4	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.119	0.115	0.103	0.098	94.0	94.1	1.1	24.2	66.4	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.165	0.154	0.131	0.128	94.0	94.3	0.0	22.5	63.0	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.154	0.150	0.141	0.136	95.2	94.4	8.1	29.0	69.3	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.181	0.177	0.165	0.161	95.5	94.8	0.6	28.9	71.0	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.095	0.092	0.089	0.088	94.1	94.6	7.8	26.2	67.2	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.114	0.119	0.111	0.112	96.4	95.3	0.0	23.2	69.5	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.128	0.125	0.123	0.121	95.0	94.9	32.9	30.1	69.2	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.148	0.144	0.143	0.140	94.2	94.9	2.7	29.4	72.2	

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

† Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Table A.9: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a covariate X with a skewed distribution for a latent response η_2 (Case B3).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.008	-0.008	-0.004	0.226	0.232	0.119	0.105	0.108	0.062
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.077	0.085	0.002	0.441	0.545	0.115	0.119	0.124	0.049
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.004	0.002	0.278	0.281	0.173	0.144	0.148	0.100
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.047	0.049	-0.005	0.347	0.350	0.172	0.165	0.166	0.092
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.173	0.174	0.119	0.090	0.090	0.066
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.040	0.041	0.001	0.238	0.242	0.113	0.101	0.103	0.058
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.244	0.243	0.181	0.130	0.130	0.104
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.035	0.034	-0.003	0.297	0.298	0.176	0.148	0.147	0.101
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.054	0.078	-0.393	0.382	0.420	0.419	0.192	0.192	0.418
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.311	0.372	-0.515	1.031	1.143	0.541	0.315	0.325	0.548
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.169	0.182	-0.546	0.587	0.607	0.578	0.278	0.277	0.572
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.364	0.383	-0.718	1.065	1.118	0.738	0.375	0.384	0.748
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.060	0.070	-0.315	0.281	0.291	0.340	0.162	0.163	0.332
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.147	0.172	-0.479	0.511	0.549	0.488	0.265	0.264	0.494
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.117	0.120	-0.466	0.424	0.429	0.504	0.223	0.223	0.482
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.218	0.228	-0.657	0.693	0.708	0.674	0.333	0.330	0.687
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.125	0.175	-0.623	0.530	0.595	0.644	0.252	0.252	0.654
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.526	0.809	-0.787	1.975	3.496	0.809	0.442	0.434	0.827
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.153	0.178	-0.921	0.641	0.672	0.944	0.336	0.344	0.959
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.430	0.490	-1.137	1.312	1.452	1.151	0.523	0.513	1.173
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.073	0.092	-0.548	0.346	0.364	0.570	0.208	0.206	0.568
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.211	0.283	-0.752	0.712	0.821	0.758	0.333	0.351	0.771
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.167	0.175	-0.814	0.538	0.547	0.847	0.289	0.291	0.844
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.265	0.283	-1.067	0.811	0.831	1.079	0.415	0.421	1.098
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.068	0.068	0.039	0.041	0.041	0.024
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.006	0.006	-0.002	0.082	0.082	0.033	0.049	0.049	0.021
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.094	0.095	0.063	0.061	0.062	0.043
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.010	0.010	0.000	0.103	0.104	0.058	0.064	0.064	0.038
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.057	0.057	0.042	0.037	0.037	0.027
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.003	-0.002	0.069	0.069	0.039	0.045	0.045	0.026
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	0.086	0.087	0.068	0.055	0.055	0.044
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.009	0.009	0.002	0.094	0.094	0.062	0.061	0.061	0.042
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.015	0.018	-0.424	0.122	0.122	0.427	0.080	0.079	0.428
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.029	0.036	-0.550	0.212	0.214	0.551	0.123	0.120	0.552
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.021	0.023	-0.610	0.188	0.189	0.615	0.121	0.120	0.615
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.065	0.067	-0.772	0.289	0.290	0.774	0.168	0.165	0.777
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.012	0.014	-0.359	0.105	0.106	0.363	0.070	0.070	0.359
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.033	0.036	-0.502	0.167	0.169	0.503	0.105	0.107	0.507
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.017	0.017	-0.535	0.153	0.153	0.542	0.096	0.097	0.538
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.041	0.042	-0.710	0.223	0.224	0.712	0.146	0.142	0.713
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.012	0.019	-0.684	0.170	0.171	0.686	0.109	0.107	0.689
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.051	0.066	-0.831	0.290	0.298	0.832	0.170	0.172	0.834
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.029	0.034	-0.995	0.227	0.231	0.998	0.144	0.147	0.998
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.062	0.067	-1.193	0.362	0.366	1.194	0.216	0.212	1.198
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.007	0.010	-0.602	0.133	0.135	0.605	0.082	0.083	0.605
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.040	0.048	-0.781	0.222	0.226	0.782	0.143	0.146	0.782
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.025	0.026	-0.905	0.198	0.199	0.910	0.129	0.126	0.909
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.050	0.051	-1.126	0.265	0.266	1.128	0.175	0.176	1.128

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

R_Y^2 and R_η^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Results for 1-step and 2-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 1–11 of the 1000 simulations in four settings.

Table A.10: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a covariate X with a skewed distribution for a latent response η_2 (Case B3).

p	π_Y	R^2_Y	R^2_η	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]		
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.	
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)						
$n = 200$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.226	0.179	0.232	0.179	97.9	97.5	94.4	92.2	94.5	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.434	0.254	0.539	0.281	99.4	98.9	96.0	86.7	96.6	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.278	0.247	0.281	0.247	97.8	97.8	94.6	95.3	95.3	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.344	0.300	0.347	0.299	98.3	98.1	95.2	92.9	96.2	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.173	0.154	0.174	0.154	97.1	97.1	95.0	95.5	94.9	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.235	0.193	0.239	0.193	98.2	98.0	94.6	92.3	94.3	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.244	0.220	0.243	0.219	96.9	96.9	95.7	97.0	95.5	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.295	0.250	0.296	0.250	98.0	97.8	95.6	95.8	95.8	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.378	0.332	0.413	0.340	94.1	94.6	10.4	62.4	87.8	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.984	0.958	1.081	0.852	93.8	94.5	5.1	64.7	90.6	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.563	0.482	0.579	0.486	95.7	96.0	15.2	71.0	91.4	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	1.001	0.814	1.051	0.860	95.4	96.1	5.5	77.9	93.6	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.275	0.257	0.282	0.259	95.1	95.2	21.9	66.2	88.6	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.490	0.427	0.521	0.437	93.7	94.1	4.6	70.4	89.6	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.408	0.387	0.412	0.388	96.3	96.1	25.9	74.6	92.6	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.658	0.563	0.670	0.566	95.2	95.1	7.8	80.1	93.5	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.516	0.456	0.569	0.470	94.7	95.6	4.8	48.7	83.3	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	1.904	1.195	3.403	2.629	91.3	93.1	3.6	54.1	83.9	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.622	0.584	0.649	0.592	95.0	96.0	3.6	62.8	89.4	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	1.240	1.093	1.367	1.100	95.1	95.1	1.9	70.4	91.1	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.338	0.323	0.353	0.330	94.7	94.8	6.5	52.9	84.5	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.681	0.583	0.771	0.618	93.4	94.4	1.0	57.6	85.9	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.512	0.476	0.519	0.480	95.3	95.1	6.0	65.0	88.2	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.767	0.710	0.781	0.718	95.7	95.9	1.0	72.6	92.4	
$n = 1000$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.068	0.064	0.068	0.064	95.4	95.3	95.1	98.5	94.6	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.081	0.076	0.082	0.076	95.5	95.4	94.1	97.1	95.0	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.094	0.089	0.095	0.089	95.1	95.1	94.8	99.0	94.9	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.103	0.099	0.103	0.098	95.5	95.5	94.2	98.7	94.6	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.057	0.058	0.057	0.058	96.5	96.6	96.2	99.1	95.7	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.069	0.066	0.069	0.066	95.9	95.9	94.9	98.4	94.7	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.086	0.083	0.087	0.083	94.8	94.6	94.7	99.4	94.4	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.094	0.089	0.094	0.089	96.3	96.1	95.5	99.2	95.6	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.121	0.127	0.121	0.127	96.3	96.3	0.0	63.6	91.0	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.210	0.203	0.211	0.204	94.0	94.1	0.0	71.5	89.5	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.187	0.179	0.188	0.179	94.2	93.5	0.0	72.9	88.5	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.282	0.261	0.283	0.261	94.8	94.9	0.0	80.4	91.2	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.104	0.104	0.105	0.104	95.8	95.7	0.0	66.4	90.0	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.662	0.164	0.159	0.165	0.160	95.1	94.7	0.0	73.1	90.4	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.152	0.154	0.152	0.154	95.0	94.8	0.0	75.2	91.1	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.993	0.219	0.213	0.220	0.213	95.6	95.4	0.0	81.3	92.5	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.169	0.167	0.170	0.166	94.7	95.1	0.0	50.8	83.7	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.286	0.284	0.291	0.284	94.3	94.9	0.0	60.2	87.4	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.225	0.227	0.228	0.228	95.8	96.4	0.0	63.3	89.4	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.357	0.337	0.360	0.338	94.6	95.2	0.0	73.9	91.1	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.132	0.131	0.135	0.133	94.5	94.4	0.0	53.3	84.8	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.937	0.218	0.212	0.221	0.214	94.9	95.2	0.0	61.8	88.3	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.196	0.189	0.197	0.191	95.0	95.0	0.0	65.4	86.7	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.405	0.261	0.272	0.262	0.272	96.9	96.8	0.0	74.6	94.3	

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

R^2_Y and R^2_η the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

† Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Results for 1-step and 2-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge. This occurred in 1–11 of the 1000 simulations in four settings.

Table A.11: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed response Z (Case C1).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_Z^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	0.067	0.070	0.067	0.041	0.042	0.040
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	0.089	0.104	0.088	0.050	0.057	0.050
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.039	0.040	0.039	0.024	0.025	0.024
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.044	0.046	0.044	0.027	0.029	0.027
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.059	0.060	0.059	0.038	0.038	0.038
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	0.068	0.071	0.068	0.042	0.043	0.042
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.038	0.038	0.037	0.025	0.025	0.025
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.040	0.040	0.040	0.025	0.025	0.025
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.003	0.012	0.003	0.111	0.113	0.111	0.072	0.071	0.071
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.008	0.027	0.008	0.159	0.159	0.156	0.088	0.087	0.090
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.000	0.003	0.000	0.060	0.061	0.061	0.041	0.040	0.041
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.005	-0.000	-0.004	0.065	0.063	0.066	0.044	0.042	0.044
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	-0.004	0.001	-0.004	0.083	0.085	0.083	0.056	0.057	0.056
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.005	0.018	0.006	0.114	0.119	0.114	0.070	0.068	0.069
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.051	0.051	0.051	0.035	0.034	0.035
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.002	0.001	-0.002	0.055	0.056	0.056	0.037	0.038	0.037
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.002	0.012	0.003	0.134	0.129	0.134	0.083	0.082	0.084
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	-0.001	0.028	0.006	0.181	0.191	0.188	0.101	0.091	0.104
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.073	0.070	0.074	0.049	0.045	0.050
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	-0.005	0.003	-0.003	0.086	0.082	0.087	0.057	0.056	0.058
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.005	0.013	0.005	0.107	0.107	0.107	0.067	0.070	0.070
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.008	0.024	0.010	0.137	0.146	0.139	0.083	0.083	0.084
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.061	0.061	0.061	0.039	0.040	0.039
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	-0.003	0.002	-0.003	0.067	0.068	0.067	0.044	0.045	0.046
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.028	0.029	0.028	0.019	0.019	0.019
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.022	0.022	0.022
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017	0.018	0.017	0.012	0.012	0.012
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.012	0.012	0.012
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.026	0.026	0.025	0.016	0.016	0.016
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.019	0.020	0.020
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.011	0.011	0.011
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.011	0.011	0.011
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.046	0.044	0.046	0.030	0.029	0.030
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.006	0.008	0.007	0.060	0.057	0.061	0.041	0.039	0.040
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.001	0.000	-0.001	0.026	0.025	0.026	0.017	0.017	0.017
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	0.031	0.030	0.031	0.022	0.021	0.021
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	-0.000	0.001	-0.001	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.023	0.023	0.023
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	-0.000	0.003	-0.000	0.045	0.046	0.046	0.031	0.031	0.031
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.015	0.015	0.015
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.000	0.001	-0.000	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.016	0.017	0.017
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.058	0.052	0.058	0.039	0.034	0.039
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	-0.001	0.002	-0.002	0.074	0.065	0.074	0.049	0.043	0.050
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.031	0.030	0.031	0.021	0.020	0.021
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.037	0.034	0.037	0.025	0.022	0.026
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	-0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.044	0.043	0.044	0.029	0.028	0.029
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	-0.001	0.003	-0.001	0.053	0.052	0.053	0.035	0.034	0.035
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.017	0.017	0.018
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.028	0.029	0.029	0.019	0.019	0.020

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_Z^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and Z , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Table A.12: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed response Z (Case C1).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_Z^2	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]		
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.	
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)						
$n = 200$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.067	0.065	0.070	0.066	97.9	97.6	94.7	92.5	95.2	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.089	0.085	0.105	0.093	98.6	98.4	91.8	86.4	93.3	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.039	0.039	0.040	0.040	97.7	97.7	96.1	95.7	96.3	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.045	0.044	0.046	0.045	98.1	97.8	95.0	93.7	95.6	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.059	0.058	0.060	0.059	96.5	96.2	94.6	95.9	94.7	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.068	0.067	0.072	0.069	97.2	96.6	94.3	92.9	94.5	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.038	0.036	0.038	0.037	96.0	95.9	95.4	96.9	95.3	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.040	0.039	0.040	0.040	96.9	96.7	95.4	96.0	95.3	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.111	0.105	0.112	0.102	92.5	92.7	72.9	46.8	79.6	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.159	0.145	0.157	0.141	89.6	91.9	67.6	43.1	74.7	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.060	0.058	0.060	0.057	93.5	92.9	73.2	50.2	79.4	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.065	0.066	0.063	0.064	93.6	93.9	75.7	47.8	82.0	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.083	0.080	0.085	0.081	92.1	92.5	76.9	48.1	80.0	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.113	0.105	0.118	0.107	91.1	92.3	72.7	42.1	77.1	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.051	0.048	0.051	0.048	93.5	93.7	77.7	51.8	80.6	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.055	0.055	0.056	0.054	93.0	93.2	77.0	48.1	80.4	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.134	0.131	0.128	0.119	92.7	92.7	59.9	33.4	73.5	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.181	0.182	0.189	0.163	93.5	94.6	58.4	31.4	73.9	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.073	0.072	0.070	0.067	94.1	93.9	60.8	35.9	74.5	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.086	0.083	0.082	0.078	93.4	93.7	59.0	34.1	71.9	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.107	0.101	0.106	0.100	93.5	94.2	63.5	30.3	69.7	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.137	0.133	0.144	0.131	92.8	93.9	61.0	26.8	67.9	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.061	0.059	0.061	0.058	93.9	93.7	65.9	33.3	71.0	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.067	0.067	0.068	0.066	93.8	93.5	65.6	30.8	71.2	
$n = 1000$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.028	0.028	0.029	0.028	95.8	95.5	94.9	98.4	95.1	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.034	0.033	0.034	0.033	96.0	95.9	95.1	97.3	95.1	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.017	95.2	95.2	94.9	99.1	95.0	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.020	0.019	0.020	0.019	95.4	95.4	94.6	98.7	94.7	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.026	0.025	0.026	0.025	95.0	95.0	94.8	99.1	94.8	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.030	0.028	0.030	0.028	93.9	93.8	93.3	98.4	93.3	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	94.5	94.5	94.3	99.4	94.1	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.017	95.8	95.8	95.1	99.2	95.3	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.046	0.045	0.043	0.043	94.7	93.4	74.7	46.9	82.1	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.060	0.058	0.057	0.055	93.8	94.2	70.5	43.9	78.2	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.026	0.025	0.025	0.025	93.1	92.8	76.4	50.5	82.2	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.031	0.029	0.030	0.028	92.5	92.6	73.2	48.4	78.4	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035	95.2	95.6	80.5	47.5	83.8	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.045	0.044	0.046	0.044	94.4	94.4	73.7	42.8	78.0	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.022	0.021	0.022	0.021	94.4	94.1	79.8	52.2	82.6	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.025	0.024	0.025	0.024	95.3	95.2	77.9	48.7	81.5	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.058	0.057	0.052	0.051	94.0	94.9	60.9	33.7	74.6	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.074	0.074	0.065	0.064	93.4	94.0	55.1	32.2	74.0	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.031	0.032	0.030	0.030	95.9	95.3	64.1	35.7	77.9	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.037	0.036	0.034	0.034	94.2	94.8	61.9	34.7	75.7	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.044	0.044	0.043	0.043	93.9	93.9	65.5	30.4	71.3	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.053	0.055	0.052	0.053	95.4	95.8	62.7	27.8	70.3	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.025	95.3	94.9	66.8	33.7	72.0	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.028	0.030	0.029	0.029	95.6	94.9	68.7	31.5	74.7	

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

R_Y^2 and R_Z^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and Z , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

[†] Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Table A.13: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally skew-normally distributed response Z (Case C2).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_Z^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
					2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.068	0.070	0.067	0.040	0.042	0.040
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.005	0.008	0.003	0.085	0.113	0.084	0.043	0.048	0.043
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.039	0.040	0.039	0.025	0.026	0.025
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	-0.000	0.044	0.046	0.044	0.026	0.027	0.026
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.056	0.057	0.056	0.037	0.038	0.037
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	-0.000	0.064	0.067	0.064	0.041	0.043	0.041
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.036	0.036	0.036	0.024	0.025	0.024
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.040	0.040	0.040	0.026	0.026	0.026
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.007	0.016	0.007	0.114	0.113	0.113	0.071	0.067	0.070
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.022	0.043	0.008	0.173	0.193	0.160	0.093	0.090	0.089
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.002	0.001	-0.002	0.059	0.057	0.059	0.038	0.036	0.038
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.008	0.014	0.001	0.076	0.076	0.071	0.048	0.047	0.048
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.004	0.009	0.004	0.086	0.088	0.085	0.057	0.058	0.057
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.019	0.035	0.010	0.119	0.128	0.111	0.069	0.069	0.066
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.034	0.034	0.034
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.005	0.010	0.000	0.059	0.061	0.055	0.037	0.037	0.035
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	-0.000	0.014	-0.000	0.142	0.133	0.142	0.088	0.082	0.087
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.020	0.052	0.009	0.193	0.206	0.194	0.107	0.097	0.109
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	-0.003	0.002	-0.003	0.072	0.068	0.072	0.050	0.046	0.049
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.006	0.015	-0.001	0.089	0.088	0.087	0.056	0.053	0.055
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.003	0.012	0.002	0.112	0.112	0.111	0.071	0.074	0.071
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.020	0.034	0.010	0.145	0.150	0.140	0.087	0.083	0.085
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.062	0.063	0.062	0.040	0.040	0.040
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.003	0.009	-0.002	0.069	0.070	0.067	0.046	0.046	0.045
$n = 1000$													
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.019	0.019	0.019
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.033	0.033	0.032	0.021	0.021	0.021
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.012	0.012	0.012
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.013	0.013	0.013
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.024	0.025	0.024	0.016	0.016	0.016
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.028	0.029	0.028	0.018	0.019	0.019
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.011	0.011	0.011
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.011	0.011	0.011
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.001	0.002	0.000	0.045	0.043	0.045	0.030	0.029	0.030
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.017	0.021	0.003	0.065	0.064	0.058	0.040	0.037	0.038
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.026	0.025	0.026	0.017	0.016	0.017
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.007	0.007	0.000	0.033	0.032	0.030	0.021	0.021	0.020
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.035	0.036	0.035	0.023	0.023	0.023
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.008	0.013	-0.000	0.048	0.050	0.045	0.030	0.032	0.029
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.015	0.015	0.014
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.004	0.005	-0.000	0.025	0.025	0.024	0.017	0.017	0.016
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.005	0.007	0.004	0.059	0.053	0.058	0.039	0.033	0.038
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.025	0.029	0.004	0.084	0.076	0.076	0.051	0.047	0.049
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.032	0.031	0.032	0.022	0.021	0.022
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.011	0.014	0.002	0.040	0.039	0.037	0.025	0.026	0.023
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	-0.000	0.002	-0.000	0.044	0.042	0.044	0.029	0.028	0.029
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.012	0.015	0.001	0.059	0.057	0.055	0.038	0.035	0.035
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.017	0.017	0.017
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.006	0.007	-0.000	0.030	0.031	0.029	0.019	0.019	0.019

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$, R_Y^2 and R_Z^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and Z , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Table A.14: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of a latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally skew-normally distributed response Z (Case C2).

p	π_Y	R_Y^2	R_Z^2	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]		
					2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.	
					s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)						
$n = 200$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.068	0.066	0.070	0.067	97.9	97.6	95.7	93.1	95.9	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.085	0.085	0.113	0.101	99.4	99.2	95.7	87.8	96.6	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.039	0.039	0.040	0.040	96.5	96.3	94.9	95.6	95.0	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.044	0.044	0.046	0.046	97.2	97.0	94.3	93.7	95.0	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.056	0.057	0.057	0.058	96.7	96.6	94.8	95.8	95.1	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.064	0.067	0.067	0.069	98.8	98.3	95.6	93.1	95.8	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.036	0.037	0.036	0.037	97.5	97.3	96.5	97.2	96.5	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.040	0.039	0.040	0.040	96.8	96.5	95.2	96.0	94.9	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.113	0.106	0.112	0.103	93.1	92.6	72.9	46.2	80.1	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.172	0.705	0.188	0.150	91.5	93.7	69.4	42.8	78.9	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.059	0.057	0.057	0.056	92.6	94.0	75.3	49.9	80.1	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.075	0.069	0.075	0.068	93.2	93.3	73.6	47.6	79.3	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.086	0.082	0.088	0.083	93.6	93.9	76.5	47.5	79.7	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.117	0.109	0.123	0.112	93.7	95.1	73.5	41.4	77.4	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.050	0.048	0.050	0.048	93.0	93.0	79.5	52.2	81.9	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.059	0.056	0.060	0.056	93.7	93.7	78.6	47.5	80.3	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.142	0.132	0.132	0.119	91.1	92.6	57.6	32.7	70.2	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.193	0.192	0.199	0.170	94.4	94.8	57.8	30.5	74.1	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.072	0.071	0.068	0.068	93.2	94.7	62.5	35.6	75.2	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.089	0.085	0.087	0.080	94.5	94.0	61.9	33.7	74.3	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.112	0.101	0.112	0.100	92.7	92.9	61.5	30.1	68.0	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.143	0.136	0.146	0.133	93.4	95.3	60.5	26.3	67.6	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.062	0.059	0.063	0.058	92.9	93.1	65.7	33.1	69.9	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.069	0.068	0.069	0.067	93.4	94.1	65.3	30.1	70.9	
$n = 1000$														
4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.029	0.028	0.029	0.028	95.1	95.0	94.0	98.4	94.1	
4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.033	0.033	0.033	0.033	95.8	95.7	94.3	97.4	94.5	
4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.018	0.017	0.018	0.017	95.0	95.0	94.7	99.0	94.7	
4	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.018	0.019	0.018	0.019	96.5	96.5	96.3	98.8	96.4	
8	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.024	0.025	0.025	0.025	96.3	96.1	95.7	99.2	95.7	
8	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.000	0.028	0.028	0.029	0.029	95.3	95.3	95.0	98.5	94.9	
8	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.017	0.016	0.017	0.016	94.3	94.2	94.1	99.4	94.1	
8	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.017	96.6	96.6	96.5	99.2	96.3	
4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.045	0.045	0.043	0.043	94.8	95.8	74.9	46.8	83.3	
4	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.063	0.060	0.060	0.057	94.5	94.5	70.9	43.2	78.4	
4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.026	0.025	0.025	0.025	95.1	94.5	76.2	50.5	82.0	
4	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.032	0.030	0.031	0.029	94.6	94.9	75.1	48.2	78.9	
8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.036	94.6	94.6	79.5	47.6	82.1	
8	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.302	0.047	0.045	0.049	0.045	94.8	94.5	74.1	42.3	77.9	
8	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.022	0.021	0.022	0.021	94.1	93.5	79.2	52.0	81.8	
8	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.201	0.025	0.024	0.025	0.024	94.9	94.6	79.8	48.3	81.4	
4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.059	0.057	0.053	0.051	95.5	94.8	59.1	33.7	74.5	
4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.081	0.078	0.071	0.067	95.7	95.3	56.7	31.8	72.1	
4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.032	0.032	0.031	0.030	95.0	94.3	61.0	35.8	74.5	
4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.038	0.038	0.037	0.035	94.3	93.3	64.3	34.0	75.7	
8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.044	0.044	0.042	0.043	94.1	94.7	67.6	30.4	72.4	
8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.427	0.057	0.057	0.055	0.054	95.0	95.5	61.8	27.0	69.1	
8	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.025	0.026	0.025	0.025	94.8	94.6	69.7	33.7	76.5	
8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.285	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.029	95.5	94.1	69.5	30.8	74.5	

Note: p denotes number of measurement items Y_j , π_Y marginal proportion of $Y_j = 1$,

R_Y^2 and R_Z^2 the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and Z , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

[†] Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Table A.15: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_1 of latent covariate η_1 for a conditionally normally distributed latent response η_2 , when each latent variable is measured by 4 measurement items with 4 ordered categories (Case D).

R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.0	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.110	0.113	0.079	0.068	0.070	0.048
0.6	0.0	0.000	-0.001	0.005	-0.001	0.096	0.204	0.079	0.063	0.063	0.051
0.4	0.2	0.447	0.003	0.014	-0.125	0.152	0.154	0.169	0.096	0.093	0.146
0.6	0.2	0.447	0.002	0.006	-0.078	0.129	0.130	0.134	0.087	0.085	0.106
0.4	0.4	0.632	0.003	0.018	-0.179	0.198	0.192	0.233	0.126	0.120	0.212
0.6	0.4	0.632	0.010	0.016	-0.103	0.157	0.154	0.169	0.102	0.098	0.134
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.046	0.046	0.033	0.031	0.031	0.022
0.6	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.039	0.039	0.032	0.027	0.027	0.022
0.4	0.2	0.447	-0.001	0.002	-0.132	0.065	0.065	0.140	0.043	0.043	0.135
0.6	0.2	0.447	0.000	0.002	-0.081	0.055	0.055	0.094	0.036	0.036	0.084
0.4	0.4	0.632	-0.005	-0.001	-0.189	0.080	0.079	0.198	0.054	0.051	0.195
0.6	0.4	0.632	0.002	0.004	-0.112	0.065	0.062	0.125	0.045	0.044	0.113

Note: R_Y^2 and R_η^2 denote the R^2 statistics in models for Y_j and η_2 , and β_1 true value of β_1 .

Table A.16: Simulation results for standard error estimates of the estimates considered in Table A.15.

R_Y^2	R_η^2	β_1	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
			2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
			s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)					
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.0	0.000	0.110	0.107	0.113	0.108	97.2	97.1	95.0	92.7	95.0
0.6	0.0	0.000	0.096	0.092	0.204	0.111	96.8	96.6	95.3	95.5	95.3
0.4	0.2	0.447	0.152	0.152	0.154	0.151	93.1	93.6	46.1	45.8	80.9
0.6	0.2	0.447	0.130	0.124	0.130	0.123	93.3	93.5	60.1	48.5	80.5
0.4	0.4	0.632	0.198	0.188	0.191	0.180	92.2	93.0	31.5	28.4	68.4
0.6	0.4	0.632	0.157	0.153	0.153	0.148	93.3	94.0	46.9	30.1	70.7
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.0	0.000	0.046	0.046	0.047	0.046	95.3	95.3	95.2	98.4	95.2
0.6	0.0	0.000	0.039	0.039	0.039	0.039	95.1	95.1	95.0	99.1	95.0
0.4	0.2	0.447	0.065	0.066	0.065	0.065	95.0	95.4	9.5	45.6	81.3
0.6	0.2	0.447	0.055	0.054	0.055	0.054	94.3	94.5	30.1	48.9	82.4
0.4	0.4	0.632	0.080	0.081	0.079	0.077	95.6	95.3	3.2	28.9	70.9
0.6	0.4	0.632	0.065	0.066	0.062	0.064	95.2	96.3	15.5	30.5	72.2

[†] Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Table A.17: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) (Case E).

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 100$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.036	0.044	-0.037	0.451	0.756	0.235	0.198	0.214	0.150
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.034	0.036	-0.021	0.302	0.326	0.195	0.158	0.161	0.131
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.007	0.049	-0.120	0.524	0.623	0.291	0.230	0.249	0.223
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.053	0.074	-0.068	0.341	0.427	0.227	0.186	0.195	0.165
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.026	0.154	-0.257	0.514	0.954	0.367	0.284	0.302	0.336
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.057	0.108	-0.178	0.427	0.486	0.319	0.226	0.232	0.261
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.018	-0.019	-0.056	0.276	0.962	0.167	0.144	0.152	0.120
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.019	-0.017	-0.036	0.184	1.183	0.124	0.109	0.114	0.089
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.024	0.039	-0.127	0.260	0.272	0.193	0.161	0.151	0.164
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.010	0.005	-0.099	0.212	0.487	0.170	0.127	0.133	0.135
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.024	0.065	-0.270	0.346	0.350	0.323	0.211	0.195	0.311
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.011	0.039	-0.213	0.258	0.490	0.266	0.163	0.158	0.236
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.003	0.004	-0.073	0.093	0.092	0.089	0.059	0.058	0.078
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.002	-0.245	-0.048	0.077	3.529	0.070	0.050	0.052	0.057
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.001	-0.092	-0.148	0.106	2.134	0.159	0.070	0.064	0.154
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.002	-0.354	-0.107	0.085	5.133	0.120	0.058	0.059	0.110
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.007	0.012	-0.288	0.141	0.133	0.297	0.094	0.091	0.292
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.002	-0.567	-0.223	0.110	8.196	0.233	0.072	0.070	0.227

Note: R_Y^2 denotes the R^2 statistic in measurement models for items Y_j .

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 0–9 of the 1000 simulations in different settings.

Table A.18: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) (Case E). **Note:** Here bias of the estimates is quantified by the difference between their median over the simulations and the true value of β_2 , whereas in Table A.17 the simulation mean rather than the median was used for this. Other columns of this table identical to those of Table A.17.

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Bias (median)			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 100$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	-0.045	-0.033	-0.097	0.451	0.756	0.235	0.198	0.214	0.150
0.6	0.390	0.309	-0.020	-0.015	-0.066	0.302	0.326	0.195	0.158	0.161	0.131
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.089	-0.059	-0.183	0.524	0.623	0.291	0.230	0.249	0.223
0.6	0.273	0.423	-0.006	-0.002	-0.109	0.341	0.427	0.227	0.186	0.195	0.165
0.4	0.000	0.632	-0.090	0.000	-0.317	0.514	0.954	0.367	0.284	0.302	0.336
0.6	0.000	0.632	-0.035	0.011	-0.230	0.427	0.486	0.319	0.226	0.232	0.261
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	-0.025	-0.013	-0.091	0.276	0.962	0.167	0.144	0.152	0.120
0.6	0.390	0.309	-0.003	-0.004	-0.057	0.184	1.183	0.124	0.109	0.114	0.089
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.021	-0.009	-0.151	0.260	0.272	0.193	0.161	0.151	0.164
0.6	0.273	0.423	-0.022	-0.011	-0.120	0.212	0.487	0.170	0.127	0.133	0.135
0.4	0.000	0.632	-0.050	-0.008	-0.304	0.346	0.350	0.323	0.211	0.195	0.311
0.6	0.000	0.632	-0.026	-0.019	-0.233	0.258	0.490	0.266	0.163	0.158	0.236
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	-0.002	-0.003	-0.077	0.093	0.092	0.089	0.059	0.058	0.078
0.6	0.390	0.309	-0.005	-0.005	-0.054	0.077	3.529	0.070	0.050	0.052	0.057
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.012	-0.008	-0.154	0.106	2.134	0.159	0.070	0.064	0.154
0.6	0.273	0.423	-0.002	0.003	-0.110	0.085	5.133	0.120	0.058	0.059	0.110
0.4	0.000	0.632	-0.007	0.001	-0.292	0.141	0.133	0.297	0.094	0.091	0.292
0.6	0.000	0.632	-0.004	-0.002	-0.227	0.110	8.196	0.233	0.072	0.070	0.227

Note: R_Y^2 denotes the R^2 statistic in measurement models for items Y_j .

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 0–9 of the 1000 simulations in different settings.

Table A.19: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) (Case E).

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
			2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
			s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)					
$n = 100$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.450	1.937	0.755	2.350	93.2	94.2	63.8	58.9	87.8
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.300	0.299	0.324	0.303	93.6	93.1	68.7	64.1	89.2
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.524	0.581	0.621	0.513	88.6	91.1	49.2	53.4	80.3
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.337	0.332	0.421	0.343	92.7	92.7	60.1	56.3	85.9
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.514	1.893	0.942	0.657	88.4	90.3	34.9	42.9	76.8
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.423	0.427	0.474	0.429	89.4	91.1	44.2	43.8	79.4
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.276	0.255	0.962	0.486	95.2	95.2	56.6	64.2	89.3
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.183	0.181	1.184	0.304	94.0	94.3	70.3	69.7	89.9
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.259	0.277	0.269	0.268	93.3	94.5	45.8	56.4	86.0
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.212	0.203	0.487	0.225	91.6	91.9	52.0	59.7	84.3
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.345	0.354	0.344	0.330	91.0	93.6	22.8	44.0	79.8
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.258	0.256	0.488	0.368	92.6	93.1	29.1	45.4	80.8
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.093	0.095	0.092	0.092	95.4	94.8	36.7	73.1	90.8
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.077	0.074	3.523	0.134	94.7	94.5	54.9	74.6	89.7
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.106	0.106	2.133	0.146	93.4	93.2	10.8	62.0	87.4
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.085	0.083	5.123	0.155	93.8	93.8	22.6	62.3	87.1
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.141	0.137	0.132	0.127	93.2	94.2	0.9	47.2	81.0
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.110	0.107	8.181	0.195	94.0	94.6	2.6	46.5	80.6

[†] Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge. This occurred in 0–9 of the 1000 simulations in different settings.

Table A.20: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) and where the measurement model includes cross-loadings from η_1 to measures of η_2 (Case F).

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.019	0.073	-0.099	0.341	0.935	0.230	0.158	0.176	0.161
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.025	0.046	-0.067	0.216	0.346	0.177	0.123	0.127	0.127
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.026	0.068	-0.134	0.470	0.921	0.303	0.173	0.181	0.196
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.007	-0.202	-0.108	0.231	5.275	0.207	0.139	0.147	0.163
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.033	0.152	0.014	0.528	0.700	7.030	0.236	0.234	0.300
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.009	0.044	-0.159	0.291	0.313	0.272	0.176	0.177	0.226
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.002	0.010	-0.116	0.192	0.112	0.135	0.072	0.070	0.125
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.002	-0.046	-0.087	0.082	1.613	0.106	0.055	0.055	0.093
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.012	0.005	-0.163	0.230	0.124	0.181	0.081	0.083	0.173
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.001	0.006	-0.115	0.091	0.092	0.134	0.059	0.058	0.121
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.007	0.017	-0.239	0.160	0.155	0.260	0.099	0.095	0.251
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.005	-0.103	-0.169	0.122	3.527	0.192	0.080	0.083	0.176

Note: R_Y^2 denotes the R^2 statistic in measurement models for items Y_j .

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 0–1 of the 1000 simulations in different settings.

Table A.21: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) and where the measurement model includes cross-loadings from η_1 to measures of η_2 (Case F). **Note:** Here bias of the estimates is quantified by the difference between their median over the simulations and the true value of β_2 , whereas in Table A.20 the simulation mean rather than the median was used for this. Other columns of this table identical to those of Table A.20.

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Bias (median)			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	-0.023	-0.006	-0.132	0.341	0.935	0.230	0.158	0.176	0.161
0.6	0.390	0.309	-0.002	0.011	-0.088	0.216	0.346	0.177	0.123	0.127	0.127
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.031	0.014	-0.178	0.470	0.921	0.303	0.173	0.181	0.196
0.6	0.273	0.423	-0.029	-0.007	-0.136	0.231	5.275	0.207	0.139	0.147	0.163
0.4	0.000	0.632	-0.076	-0.004	-0.279	0.528	0.700	7.030	0.236	0.234	0.300
0.6	0.000	0.632	-0.041	-0.013	-0.200	0.291	0.313	0.272	0.176	0.177	0.226
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	-0.004	-0.001	-0.125	0.192	0.112	0.135	0.072	0.070	0.125
0.6	0.390	0.309	-0.004	0.000	-0.091	0.082	1.613	0.106	0.055	0.055	0.093
0.4	0.273	0.423	-0.015	-0.009	-0.173	0.230	0.124	0.181	0.081	0.083	0.173
0.6	0.273	0.423	-0.004	-0.001	-0.120	0.091	0.092	0.134	0.059	0.058	0.121
0.4	0.000	0.632	-0.013	0.005	-0.251	0.160	0.155	0.260	0.099	0.095	0.251
0.6	0.000	0.632	-0.005	-0.002	-0.176	0.122	3.527	0.192	0.080	0.083	0.176

Note: R_Y^2 denotes the R^2 statistic in measurement models for items Y_j .

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 0–1 of the 1000 simulations in different settings.

Table A.22: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) and where the measurement model includes cross-loadings from η_1 to measures of η_2 (Case F).

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
			2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
			s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)					
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.340	0.624	0.933	0.533	94.7	95.0	66.7	61.9	90.1
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.214	0.220	0.343	0.233	94.8	94.4	73.6	64.0	89.5
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.470	2.922	0.919	0.464	94.9	95.6	56.9	54.6	88.9
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.232	0.234	5.273	0.334	92.4	93.0	59.7	55.9	85.7
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.527	2.240	0.684	0.506	88.8	90.7	43.6	46.2	79.1
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.291	0.301	0.310	0.296	90.5	91.7	50.1	44.6	79.3
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.192	0.164	0.111	0.109	95.1	94.9	38.9	70.8	90.2
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.082	0.081	1.613	0.094	94.8	94.4	48.4	70.5	90.5
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.230	2.564	0.124	0.121	94.1	94.5	24.1	61.8	85.9
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.091	0.092	0.092	0.093	95.1	95.2	34.2	60.1	87.2
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.160	0.159	0.154	0.151	93.3	94.3	12.1	50.5	83.9
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.122	0.120	3.527	0.162	94.2	92.7	23.0	47.2	80.5

[†] Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 0–1 of the 1000 simulations in different settings.

Table A.23: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) and where the measurement model includes cross-loadings from η_1 to measures of η_2 (as in case G), but when the measurement model is estimated without the cross-loadings (as in case F) (Case G).

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Bias			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.246	0.314	0.026	0.634	1.064	0.174	0.263	0.371	0.095
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.252	0.320	0.074	0.461	1.022	0.178	0.247	0.341	0.095
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.369	0.542	-0.033	0.787	1.199	0.198	0.306	0.442	0.123
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.402	0.552	0.038	0.601	0.808	0.187	0.337	0.460	0.112
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.491	0.830	-0.217	0.864	1.356	0.285	0.345	0.543	0.262
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.550	0.796	-0.092	0.774	1.076	0.222	0.456	0.659	0.167
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.215	0.278	0.007	0.294	0.443	0.065	0.196	0.251	0.044
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.234	0.230	0.061	0.278	2.043	0.089	0.225	0.305	0.061
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.288	0.418	-0.072	0.352	0.912	0.098	0.274	0.345	0.078
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.325	0.468	0.003	0.365	0.888	0.072	0.309	0.416	0.048
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.450	0.714	-0.238	0.527	1.496	0.249	0.408	0.538	0.244
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.482	0.572	-0.124	0.524	3.318	0.146	0.466	0.613	0.128

Note: R_Y^2 denotes the R^2 statistic in measurement models for items Y_j .

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 1 of the 1000 simulations in one setting.

Table A.24: Simulation results for point estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) and where the measurement model includes cross-loadings from η_1 to measures of η_2 (as in case G), but when the measurement model is estimated without the cross-loadings (as in case F) (Case G). **Note:** Here bias of the estimates is quantified by the difference between their median over the simulations and the true value of β_2 , whereas in Table A.23 the simulation mean rather than the median was used for this. Other columns of this table identical to those of Table A.23.

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Bias (median)			RMSE			MAE		
			2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step	2-step	1-step	3-step
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.180	0.228	-0.008	0.634	1.064	0.174	0.263	0.371	0.095
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.201	0.273	0.049	0.461	1.022	0.178	0.247	0.341	0.095
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.263	0.380	-0.068	0.787	1.199	0.198	0.306	0.442	0.123
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.324	0.454	0.011	0.601	0.808	0.187	0.337	0.460	0.112
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.305	0.526	-0.251	0.864	1.356	0.285	0.345	0.543	0.262
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.456	0.656	-0.126	0.774	1.076	0.222	0.456	0.659	0.167
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.192	0.249	0.003	0.294	0.443	0.065	0.196	0.251	0.044
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.225	0.304	0.058	0.278	2.043	0.089	0.225	0.305	0.061
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.274	0.345	-0.074	0.352	0.912	0.098	0.274	0.345	0.078
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.309	0.416	-0.003	0.365	0.888	0.072	0.309	0.416	0.048
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.408	0.537	-0.244	0.527	1.496	0.249	0.408	0.538	0.244
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.466	0.612	-0.128	0.524	3.318	0.146	0.466	0.613	0.128

Note: R_Y^2 denotes the R^2 statistic in measurement models for items Y_j .

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 1 of the 1000 simulations in one setting.

Table A.25: Simulation results for standard error estimates of structural regression coefficient β_2 of latent covariate η_2 for a latent response η_3 , in a model which also includes another latent covariate η_1 (which has coefficient β_1) and where the measurement model includes cross-loadings from η_1 to measures of η_2 (as in case G), but when the measurement model is estimated without the cross-loadings (as in case F) (Case G).

R_Y^2	β_1	β_2	Simulation standard deviation vs. mean of est. std. error				Coverage of 95% conf. interval			2-step without step-1 var. [†]	
			2-step		1-step		2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	%var.	cover.
s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)	s.d.	m(se)						
$n = 200$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.585	1.555	1.017	1.639	99.5	99.5	73.9	64.9	95.0
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.386	1.111	0.971	0.519	98.0	98.4	78.5	70.4	92.1
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.695	1.499	1.071	4.246	98.7	98.7	63.9	60.9	92.3
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.446	0.460	0.590	0.545	96.7	97.0	73.7	68.1	86.2
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.712	1.156	1.073	1.398	99.2	97.9	32.5	55.4	93.9
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.544	0.557	0.723	0.671	97.2	97.7	57.4	62.9	83.1
$n = 1000$											
0.4	0.390	0.309	0.202	0.205	0.344	0.245	85.0	81.6	73.9	79.3	78.4
0.6	0.390	0.309	0.150	0.148	2.031	0.204	66.0	56.6	64.3	84.6	59.1
0.4	0.273	0.423	0.202	0.210	0.811	0.331	77.2	72.1	47.6	79.1	67.6
0.6	0.273	0.423	0.167	0.152	0.755	0.351	44.2	33.9	75.0	84.8	37.2
0.4	0.000	0.632	0.273	0.263	1.315	1.311	67.6	55.2	3.9	74.4	48.3
0.6	0.000	0.632	0.205	0.181	3.270	0.309	20.1	12.5	29.1	81.5	14.2

[†] Average % of the variance of 2-step estimator accounted for by step-2 variance alone, and coverage of 95% confidence interval if only this variance is included.

Results for 1-step estimates exclude simulations where the estimation did not converge.

This occurred in 1 of the 1000 simulations in one settings.

Table B.1: Estimated coefficients of structural models for extrinsic work values given different sets of covariates (with standard errors in parentheses), estimated for EVS2017 data for Netherlands. The table shows two-step (“2-st.”), one-step (“1-st.”) and naive three-step (“3-st.”) estimates. This example is considered in Section 5 of the paper, and the coefficients of gender of respondent (dummy variable for men) are also shown in Table 3 there.

	Model (1)			Model (2)			Model (3)		
	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.
Intercept	1.403 (0.113)	1.398 (0.116)	1.699 (0.057)	1.385 (0.231)	1.404 (0.238)	1.694 (0.172)	1.155 (0.287)	1.160 (0.294)	1.518 (0.224)
Man	-0.042 (0.103)	-0.033 (0.104)	-0.033 (0.082)	0.025 (0.101)	0.022 (0.104)	0.024 (0.080)	0.018 (0.102)	0.009 (0.104)	0.018 (0.081)
Age (vs. 30–49)									
15–29				0.472 (0.207)	0.489 (0.214)	0.380 (0.166)	0.448 (0.208)	0.462 (0.213)	0.364 (0.167)
50–				-0.391 (0.150)	-0.408 (0.155)	-0.326 (0.119)	-0.191 (0.152)	-0.196 (0.155)	-0.162 (0.123)
Has partner				-0.019 (0.163)	-0.022 (0.169)	-0.017 (0.133)	-0.052 (0.163)	-0.056 (0.167)	-0.048 (0.133)
Age of youngest person in household (vs. older)									
0–5				0.542 (0.194)	0.570 (0.201)	0.437 (0.151)	0.477 (0.191)	0.499 (0.195)	0.390 (0.150)
6–17				0.367 (0.150)	0.381 (0.156)	0.299 (0.120)	0.272 (0.149)	0.279 (0.153)	0.225 (0.121)
Education level (vs. upper secondary)									
Lower							-0.104 (0.144)	-0.105 (0.147)	-0.080 (0.117)
Higher							0.034 (0.133)	0.031 (0.135)	0.039 (0.107)
Occupation-based social class (vs. Managerial/service contract)									
Mixed							-0.074 (0.144)	-0.074 (0.147)	-0.069 (0.116)
Self-empl.							-0.350 (0.243)	-0.358 (0.248)	-0.273 (0.192)
Labour							0.231 (0.144)	0.229 (0.147)	0.185 (0.116)
Currently in paid employment							0.449 (0.123)	0.468 (0.125)	0.358 (0.092)
Parents’ education level (highest, vs. upper secondary)									
Lower							-0.122 (0.146)	-0.124 (0.149)	-0.108 (0.118)
Higher							-0.092 (0.159)	-0.099 (0.162)	-0.092 (0.128)

Table B.2: Estimated coefficients of structural models for intrinsic work values given different sets of covariates (with standard errors in parentheses), estimated for EVS2017 data for Netherlands. The table shows two-step (“2-st.”), one-step (“1-st.”) and naive three-step (“3-st.”) estimates. This example is considered in Section 5 of the paper, and the coefficients coefficients of gender of respondent (dummy variable for men) are also shown in Table 3 there.

	Model (1)			Model (2)			Model (3)		
	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.	2-st.	1-st.	3-st.
Intercept	0.624 (0.190)	0.611 (0.165)	0.955 (0.099)	0.474 (0.415)	0.449 (0.376)	0.847 (0.305)	1.311 (0.569)	1.087 (0.430)	1.480 (0.387)
Man	0.607 (0.193)	0.603 (0.186)	0.460 (0.142)	0.657 (0.194)	0.638 (0.176)	0.500 (0.142)	0.516 (0.188)	0.506 (0.151)	0.400 (0.139)
Age (vs. 30–49)									
15–29				0.783 (0.405)	0.749 (0.365)	0.573 (0.293)	0.568 (0.390)	0.507 (0.312)	0.417 (0.288)
50–				-0.584 (0.293)	-0.545 (0.261)	-0.452 (0.210)	-0.183 (0.283)	-0.162 (0.227)	-0.159 (0.213)
Has partner				0.412 (0.328)	0.371 (0.293)	0.311 (0.235)	0.168 (0.311)	0.108 (0.248)	0.132 (0.229)
Age of youngest person in household (vs. older)									
0–5				-0.081 (0.355)	-0.072 (0.324)	-0.067 (0.267)	-0.276 (0.349)	-0.221 (0.278)	-0.228 (0.259)
6–17				0.028 (0.282)	0.010 (0.257)	0.029 (0.213)	-0.132 (0.276)	-0.130 (0.221)	-0.098 (0.208)
Education level (vs. upper secondary)									
Lower							-0.459 (0.279)	-0.374 (0.218)	-0.378 (0.202)
Higher							0.446 (0.257)	0.365 (0.201)	0.342 (0.185)
Occupation-based social class (vs. Managerial/service contract)									
Mixed							-0.588 (0.279)	-0.503 (0.216)	-0.454 (0.200)
Self-empl.							-0.452 (0.444)	-0.402 (0.355)	-0.337 (0.332)
Labour							-0.857 (0.289)	-0.748 (0.220)	-0.652 (0.200)
Currently in paid employment							0.304 (0.219)	0.252 (0.172)	0.237 (0.160)
Parents’ education level (highest, vs. upper secondary)									
Lower							-1.009 (0.344)	-0.796 (0.239)	-0.758 (0.203)
Higher							-0.238 (0.306)	-0.180 (0.242)	-0.167 (0.221)

Table B.3: Estimated coefficients of gender (as dummy variable for men) in structural models for extrinsic work values, for each country in EVS2017 data. The table shows two-step, one-step and naive three-step estimates. The models also include as covariates the respondent's age, education, occupation-based social class and current employment status (working vs. not). All the coefficients of the structural model are estimated separately for each country, but the measurement model for work values is the same in all countries. The coefficients and confidence intervals from two-step estimation are also shown in Figure 1 in Section 5 of the paper (with the further standardisation that they are expressed on a scale where the residual variance of extrinsic values for the Netherlands is 1).

country	<i>n</i>	2-step	(s.e.)	1-step	(s.e.)	3-step	(s.e.)
Albania	1054	-0.180	(0.276)	-0.195	(0.320)	-0.016	(0.069)
Armenia	1157	-0.133	(0.076)	-0.149	(0.089)	-0.124	(0.074)
Austria	1450	-0.066	(0.089)	-0.045	(0.103)	-0.056	(0.079)
Azerbaijan	1205	-0.300	(0.099)	-0.346	(0.116)	-0.240	(0.081)
Belarus	1452	-0.092	(0.109)	-0.096	(0.127)	-0.069	(0.078)
Bosnia & Herzegovina	1002	-0.022	(0.123)	-0.023	(0.142)	-0.019	(0.098)
Bulgaria	1327	-0.085	(0.137)	-0.091	(0.156)	-0.046	(0.081)
Croatia	1328	-0.313	(0.117)	-0.352	(0.135)	-0.214	(0.086)
Czechia	1546	-0.108	(0.114)	-0.113	(0.131)	-0.078	(0.076)
Denmark	3024	-0.143	(0.087)	-0.118	(0.100)	-0.106	(0.063)
Estonia	1272	-0.088	(0.088)	-0.081	(0.104)	-0.076	(0.084)
Finland	1035	-0.130	(0.127)	-0.111	(0.146)	-0.104	(0.099)
France	1729	-0.035	(0.095)	-0.027	(0.106)	-0.026	(0.078)
Georgia	1756	0.032	(0.077)	0.051	(0.090)	0.035	(0.072)
Germany	1890	-0.159	(0.095)	-0.155	(0.109)	-0.128	(0.076)
Great Britain	1673	-0.154	(0.110)	-0.154	(0.127)	-0.105	(0.082)
Hungary	1360	-0.041	(0.100)	-0.041	(0.117)	-0.023	(0.078)
Iceland	1547	-0.156	(0.075)	-0.172	(0.089)	-0.139	(0.072)
Italy	1782	-0.141	(0.068)	-0.134	(0.077)	-0.123	(0.064)
Latvia	1204	-0.389	(0.130)	-0.441	(0.149)	-0.292	(0.091)
Lithuania	1232	-0.274	(0.138)	-0.313	(0.159)	-0.142	(0.069)
Montenegro	716	-0.283	(0.135)	-0.320	(0.153)	-0.237	(0.112)
Netherlands	2068	-0.003	(0.108)	0.032	(0.123)	-0.010	(0.077)
North Macedonia	748	0.017	(0.092)	0.022	(0.109)	0.014	(0.081)
Norway	1079	-0.322	(0.113)	-0.334	(0.129)	-0.266	(0.095)
Poland	1200	-0.213	(0.087)	-0.244	(0.098)	-0.202	(0.083)
Portugal	1092	0.169	(0.226)	0.215	(0.258)	0.077	(0.097)
Romania	1098	-0.205	(0.135)	-0.232	(0.158)	-0.139	(0.080)
Russia	1582	-0.397	(0.086)	-0.435	(0.097)	-0.363	(0.078)
Serbia	1168	0.117	(0.121)	0.133	(0.139)	0.082	(0.085)
Slovakia	1280	-0.493	(0.118)	-0.560	(0.134)	-0.391	(0.093)
Slovenia	954	-0.212	(0.117)	-0.247	(0.140)	-0.169	(0.088)
Spain	1002	0.007	(0.140)	0.020	(0.164)	-0.003	(0.084)
Sweden	1053	-0.307	(0.146)	-0.340	(0.169)	-0.225	(0.106)
Switzerland	2841	0.023	(0.072)	0.066	(0.082)	0.029	(0.057)
Ukraine	1455	-0.423	(0.125)	-0.476	(0.143)	-0.253	(0.073)

Table B.4: Estimated coefficients of gender (as dummy variable for men) in structural models for intrinsic work values, for each country in EVS2017 data. The table shows two-step, one-step and naive three-step estimates. The models also include as covariates the respondent's age, education, occupation-based social class and current employment status (working vs. not). All the coefficients of the structural model are estimated separately for each country, but the measurement model for work values is the same in all countries. The coefficients and confidence intervals from two-step estimation are also shown in Figure 1 in Section 5 of the paper (with the further standardisation that they are expressed on a scale where the residual variance of intrinsic values for the Netherlands is 1).

country	<i>n</i>	2-step	(s.e.)	1-step	(s.e.)	3-step	(s.e.)
Albania	1054	0.152	(0.237)	0.141	(0.235)	0.092	(0.122)
Armenia	1157	-0.051	(0.201)	-0.052	(0.196)	-0.039	(0.142)
Austria	1450	0.010	(0.122)	0.014	(0.119)	0.006	(0.119)
Azerbaijan	1205	0.010	(0.229)	0.003	(0.222)	0.024	(0.160)
Belarus	1452	0.235	(0.191)	0.239	(0.184)	0.164	(0.141)
Bosnia & Herzegovina	1002	-0.269	(0.161)	-0.268	(0.153)	-0.229	(0.145)
Bulgaria	1327	0.277	(0.249)	0.269	(0.242)	0.185	(0.137)
Croatia	1328	-0.204	(0.184)	-0.204	(0.178)	-0.145	(0.137)
Czechia	1546	0.463	(0.196)	0.454	(0.190)	0.295	(0.130)
Denmark	3024	0.004	(0.095)	-0.007	(0.092)	0.017	(0.079)
Estonia	1272	0.474	(0.175)	0.449	(0.169)	0.407	(0.146)
Finland	1035	0.105	(0.147)	0.096	(0.143)	0.112	(0.136)
France	1729	-0.024	(0.116)	-0.035	(0.113)	-0.026	(0.107)
Georgia	1756	0.854	(0.188)	0.813	(0.181)	0.558	(0.128)
Germany	1890	0.287	(0.116)	0.284	(0.114)	0.252	(0.101)
Great Britain	1673	0.087	(0.125)	0.077	(0.121)	0.076	(0.110)
Hungary	1360	0.268	(0.186)	0.253	(0.181)	0.203	(0.134)
Iceland	1547	-0.155	(0.121)	-0.165	(0.118)	-0.137	(0.109)
Italy	1782	0.214	(0.081)	0.192	(0.077)	0.248	(0.093)
Latvia	1204	0.049	(0.228)	0.058	(0.219)	0.033	(0.156)
Lithuania	1232	-0.033	(0.312)	-0.036	(0.304)	-0.047	(0.147)
Montenegro	716	-1.196	(0.475)	-1.146	(0.454)	-0.556	(0.213)
Netherlands	2068	0.366	(0.117)	0.355	(0.114)	0.334	(0.105)
North Macedonia	748	-0.063	(0.260)	-0.068	(0.254)	-0.007	(0.148)
Norway	1079	-0.190	(0.130)	-0.196	(0.126)	-0.174	(0.126)
Poland	1200	0.101	(0.131)	0.084	(0.125)	0.098	(0.131)
Portugal	1092	0.501	(0.311)	0.478	(0.302)	0.239	(0.147)
Romania	1098	-0.865	(0.277)	-0.849	(0.271)	-0.462	(0.134)
Russia	1582	0.054	(0.135)	0.048	(0.128)	0.039	(0.107)
Serbia	1168	-0.101	(0.238)	-0.101	(0.230)	-0.078	(0.156)
Slovakia	1280	-0.117	(0.180)	-0.105	(0.173)	-0.104	(0.145)
Slovenia	954	0.262	(0.320)	0.253	(0.312)	0.103	(0.106)
Spain	1002	0.147	(0.285)	0.134	(0.277)	0.085	(0.159)
Sweden	1053	-0.681	(0.156)	-0.689	(0.153)	-0.495	(0.116)
Switzerland	2841	0.084	(0.078)	0.077	(0.076)	0.086	(0.077)
Ukraine	1455	0.266	(0.220)	0.262	(0.213)	0.169	(0.138)