

# Econ 613 - Assignment 3

Zixuan Qi

March 23, 2022

---

## Exercise 1

### Question 1

The number of students is 340823; the number of schools is 898; the number of programs is 32.

### Question 2

The number of choices is 2773.

### Question 3

The number of students applying to at least one senior high schools in the same district to home is 265464.

## Question 4

The number of students each senior high school admitted is as follows.

```
# A tibble: 6 x 2
  schoolcode num_stu
  <int>      <int>
1    10101      398
2    10102      248
3    10103      443
4    10104      220
5    10105      346
6    10106      395
```

Figure 1: Number of Admitted Students

## Question 5

The cutoff of senior high schools is as follows.

```
# A tibble: 6 x 2
  schoolcode min_score
  <int>      <int>
1    10101      284
2    10102      343
3    10103      316
4    10104      245
5    10105      260
6    10106      293
```

Figure 2: Cutoff

## Question 6

The quality of senior high schools is as follows.

```
# A tibble: 6 x 2
  schoolcode avg_score
  <int>      <dbl>
1    10101      320.
2    10102      394.
3    10103      354.
4    10104      297.
5    10105      351.
6    10106      340.
```

Figure 3: Quality

## Exercise 2

The school level dataset is as follows.

```
# A tibble: 6 x 8
  choice      rankplace size cutoff quality sssdistrict ssslong ssslat
  <chr>      <dbl> <int> <int> <dbl> <chr>      <dbl> <dbl>
1 100101, Gene~      3    79   198   244. Wa Municip~ -2.29  10.0
2 100101, Home~      3    40   199   229. Wa Municip~ -2.29  10.0
3 100101, Tech~      4    49   201   235. Wa Municip~ -2.29  10.0
4 100102, Agri~      1    90   273   293. Wa Municip~ -2.29  10.0
5 100102, Busi~      2    90   283   303. Wa Municip~ -2.29  10.0
6 100102, Gene~      3    90   291   311. Wa Municip~ -2.29  10.0
```

Figure 4: School Level Dataset

## Exercise 3

The distance is as follows.

```
V1 schoolcode Programs schoolname sssdistrict ssslong ssslat jssdistrict jsslong jsslat distance
<chr> <int> <chr> <chr> <chr> <dbl> <dbl> <chr> <dbl> <dbl> <dbl>
1 1 50112 Home Eco~ KUMASI SENIOR~ Kumasi Metro -1.60 6.68 Bosomtwe/Atw~ -1.56 6.56 8.81
2 1 50107 General ~ ANGLICAN SENI~ Kumasi Metro -1.60 6.68 Bosomtwe/Atw~ -1.56 6.56 8.81
3 1 50202 Visual A~ TOASE SENIOR ~ Atwima / Nwa~ -1.81 6.68 Bosomtwe/Atw~ -1.56 6.56 18.9
4 1 50202 Visual A~ TOASE SENIOR ~ Atwima / Nwa~ -1.81 6.68 Bosomtwe/Atw~ -1.56 6.56 18.9
5 1 50702 Home Eco~ SIMMS SENIOR ~ Kwabre (Mamp~ -1.54 6.81 Bosomtwe/Atw~ -1.56 6.56 17.2
6 1 50901 General ~ EJURAMAN ANGL~ Ejura/Sekyed~ -1.37 7.46 Bosomtwe/Atw~ -1.56 6.56 63.9
```

Figure 5: Distance

## Exercise 4

### Question 1

Recode the schoolcode into its first three digits.

stu_dataset.schoolcode	stu_dataset.scode_rev
50112	501
50107	501
50202	502
50202	502
50702	507
50901	509

Figure 6: Revised Code

### Question 2

Recode the program variable into 4 categories.

stu_dataset.Programs	stu_dataset.pgm_rev
Home Economics	Economics
General Arts	Arts
Visual Arts	Arts
Visual Arts	Arts
Home Economics	Economics
General Arts	Arts

Figure 7: Revised Program

### Question 3

Create a new choice variable choice\_rev.

stu_dataset.scode_rev	stu_dataset.pgm_rev	stu_dataset.choice_rev
501	Economics	501 Economics
501	Arts	501 Arts
502	Arts	502 Arts
502	Arts	502 Arts
507	Economics	507 Economics
509	Arts	509 Arts

Figure 8: Revised Choice

## Question 4

Recalculate the cutoff and the quality for each recoded choice.

```
# A tibble: 6 x 3
  choice_rev rev_cutoff rev_quality
  <chr>      <int>      <dbl>
1 304 Arts      207        295.
2 304 others    219        319.
3 304 Economics 192        298.
4 210 Science   206        333.
5 210 Arts      208        291.
6 210 Economics 203        294.
```

Figure 9: Revised Cutoff and Quality

## Question 5 & 6

Consider the 20,000 highest score students. To facilitate the subsequent calculation, I only retain each students' first choice in this question.

```
# A tibble: 6 x 4
  v1      choice_rev rev_quality score
  <chr>  <chr>      <dbl> <int>
1 335624 301 Science    411.  469
2 318458 210 Science    333.  468
3 318492 210 Science    333.  467
4 335584 301 Science    411.  467
5 318422 210 Science    333.  466
6 318525 210 Science    333.  466
```

Figure 10: 20,000 Highest Score Students

## Exercise 5

### Question 1

To save the calculation time, I only regress the first choice on intercepts and the test score. The likelihood function can be seen in the `mllike` function.

## Question 2

The number of coefficients should be  $2 * 245$ . The parameters can be seen in the results of *model1*. The number of marginal effects should be 246. The values can be seen in the results of *me\_model1*.

```
> dim(model1$par)
[1] 2 245
```

(a) Coefficients

```
> dim(as.matrix(me_model1))
[1] 246 1
```

(b) Marginal Effects

Figure 11: Dimension of First Model

## Exercise 6

### Question 1

To save the calculation time, I only regress the first choice on intercepts and the school quality. The likelihood function can be seen in *mclike* function.

### Question 2

The number of coefficients should be 246. The parameters can be seen in the results of *model2*. The dimension is 247 because I set the first element 0. The number of marginal effects should be  $246 * 246$ . The values can be seen in the results of *me\_model2*.

```
> dim(as.matrix(model3$par))
[1] 247 1
```

(a) Coefficients

```
> dim(me_model2)
[1] 246 246
```

(b) Marginal Effects

Figure 12: Dimension of Second Model

## Exercise 7

### Question 1

In my opinion, the second model is appropriate in this exercise. The reason is that in the first model, the variable “score” is alternative-invariant, which means this variable does not vary with alternatives. Thus, if I use the first model and exclude alternatives containing “Others”, the results may not change. In contrast, in the second model, the variable “quality” is alternative-variant, meaning that this variable varies with alternatives. Thus, if I exclude alternatives containing “Others”, the results will change.

### Question 2 & 3

The appropriate model is the second model, thus before excluding the alternatives containing “Others”, the results are same as Exercise 6. They can be seen in *pj*. The number of probabilities should be 246. The probabilities after excluding the alternatives containing “Others” can be seen in *pj2*. The number of probabilities should be 196.

```
> dim(as.matrix(pj2))  
[1] 196  1  
> dim(as.matrix(pj))  
[1] 246  1
```

Figure 13: Probabilities