

Problem1

November 25, 2018

0.1 Problem 1.

0.1.1 Problem 1.1

For this problem, I suppose that the range part of the code has a little problem. Considering that in python, the range function doesn't include the upper bound of the range, thus, in this smallest_factor function, it is better to use $\text{int}(n^{0.5})+1$ rather than $\text{int}(n^{0.5})$ to make sure we have include all possible circumstances. To verify my suspicion, let's do following test:

```
In [7]: # introduce the function. Save this function as problem1.py
def smallest_factor(n):
    """Return the smallest prime factor of the positive integer n."""
    if n == 1: return 1
    for i in range(2, int(n**.5)+1):
        if n % i == 0: return i
    return n

In [11]: # Then, write the test for this function. Save this test as test_problem1.py
import problem1
def test_problem1():
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(2) == 2, 'failed on 2'
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(3) == 3, 'failed on 3'
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(4) == 2, 'failed on 4'
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(9) == 3, 'failed on 9'
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(13) == 13, 'failed on 13'

In [15]: ! py.test
```

```
===== test session starts =====
platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7, inifile:
collected 1 item
```

```
test_problem1.py F [100%]
```

```
===== FAILURES =====
_____ test_problem1 _____
```

```
def test_problem1():
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(2) == 2, 'failed on 2'
    assert problem1.smallest_factor(3) == 3, 'failed on 3'
>    assert problem1.smallest_factor(4) == 2, 'failed on 4'
E     AssertionError: failed on 4
E     assert 4 == 2
```

```

E          + where 4 = <function smallest_factor at 0x00000156668D8400>(4)
E          + where <function smallest_factor at 0x00000156668D8400> =
problem1.smallest_factor

test_problem1.py:5: AssertionError
===== 1 failed in 0.05 seconds =====

```

From the above test, we could see that when we test n as 4, the upper bound of the range is the same as the lower bound. Then, there is an error with the range function. What's more, there is also be an error for n as 9, where it won't test 3 as the smallest factor. Therefore, this function needs some modification.

```

In [16]: # The correct version of this function.
def smallest_factor(n):
    """Return the smallest prime factor of the positive integer n."""
    if n == 1: return 1
    for i in range(2, int(n**.5)+1):
        if n % i == 0: return i
    return n

In [19]: ! py.test

===== test session starts =====
platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7, inifile:
plugins: cov-2.6.0
collected 1 item

test_problem1.py . [100%]

===== 1 passed in 0.02 seconds =====

```

We could see that it passed all the test in the test_problem1.py now.

0.1.2 Problem 1.2

To start with, we shall test the coverage of my former test.

```

In [20]: ! py.test --cov

===== test session starts =====
platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7, inifile:
plugins: cov-2.6.0
collected 1 item

test_problem1.py . [100%]

----- coverage: platform win32, python 3.7.1-candidate-1 -----
Name                               Stmtns  Miss  Cover

```

```

-----
problem1.py          5      0    100%
test_problem1.py     7      0    100%
-----
TOTAL                12      0    100%

```

```

===== 1 passed in 0.04 seconds =====

```

Considering that it covers all codes of the `smallest_factor` function, it doesn't need supplement. We shall move to the test of the `month_length` function.

```

In [21]: # introduce the function. Save this function as problem2.py
def month_length(month, leap_year=False):
    """Return the number of days in the given month."""
    if month in {"September", "April", "June", "November"}:
        return 30
    elif month in {"January", "March", "May", "July", "August", "October", "December"}:
        return 31
    if month == "February":
        if not leap_year:
            return 28
        else:
            return 29
    else:
        return None

```

```

In [22]: # Then, write the test for this function. Save this test as test_problem2.py
import problem2
def test_problem2():
    assert problem2.month_length("February", leap_year = False) == 28, 'failed on
February in common year'
    assert problem2.month_length("February", leap_year = True) == 29, 'failed on
February in leap year'
    assert problem2.month_length("March", leap_year = False) == 31, 'failed on March in
common year'
    assert problem2.month_length("March", leap_year = True) == 31, 'failed on March in
leap year'
    assert problem2.month_length("April", leap_year = False) == 30, 'failed on April in
common year'
    assert problem2.month_length("April", leap_year = True) == 30, 'failed on April in
leap year'

```

```

In [23]: !py.test --cov

```

```

===== test session starts =====

```

```

platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7, inifile:
plugins: cov-2.6.0
collected 2 items

```

```

test_problem1.py . [ 50%]
test_problem2.py . [100%]

```

```

----- coverage: platform win32, python 3.7.1-candidate-1 -----

```

```

Name          Stmt  Miss  Cover
-----

```

problem1.py	5	0	100%
problem2.py	10	1	90%
test_problem1.py	7	0	100%
test_problem2.py	8	0	100%

TOTAL	30	1	97%

===== 2 passed in 0.07 seconds =====

From the result, we could see that this function is correct.

0.1.3 Problem 1.3

```
In [24]: # introduce the function. Save this function as problem3.py
def operate(a, b, oper):
    """Apply an arithmetic operation to a and b."""
    if type(oper) is not str:
        raise TypeError("oper must be a string")
    elif oper == '+':
        return a + b
    elif oper == '-':
        return a - b
    elif oper == '*':
        return a * b
    elif oper == '/':
        if b == 0:
            raise ZeroDivisionError("division by zero is undefined")
        return a / b
    raise ValueError("oper must be one of '+', '/', '-', or '*'")

In [25]: #Then, write the test for this function. Save this test as test_problem2.py
import pytest
import problem3
def test_problem3():
    assert problem3.operate(2,7,"+") == 9, 'failed on add function'
    assert problem3.operate(2,7,"-") == -5, 'failed on subtract function'
    assert problem3.operate(2,7,"*") == 14, 'failed on multiply function'
    assert problem3.operate(4,2,"/") == 2, 'failed on division function'
    pytest.raises(TypeError, problem3.operate, a=2, b=7, oper=2.7)
    pytest.raises(ZeroDivisionError, problem3.operate, a=2, b=0, oper='/')
    pytest.raises(ValueError, problem3.operate, a=2, b=7, oper="^")

In [27]: !py.test --cov
```

===== test session starts =====

platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\\\\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7, inifile:
plugins: cov-2.6.0
collected 3 items

test_problem1.py .	[33%]
test_problem2.py .	[66%]
test_problem3.py .	[100%]

----- coverage: platform win32, python 3.7.1-candidate-1 -----

Name	Stmts	Miss	Cover
problem1.py	5	0	100%
problem2.py	10	1	90%
problem3.py	14	0	100%
test_problem1.py	7	0	100%
test_problem2.py	8	0	100%
test_problem3.py	10	0	100%
TOTAL	54	1	98%

===== 3 passed in 0.08 seconds =====

In [28]: !py.test --cov-report html --cov

===== test session starts =====

platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7, inifile:
plugins: cov-2.6.0
collected 3 items

test_problem1.py .	[33%]
test_problem2.py .	[66%]
test_problem3.py .	[100%]

----- coverage: platform win32, python 3.7.1-candidate-1 -----
Coverage HTML written to dir htmlcov

===== 3 passed in 0.11 seconds =====

From the result, we could see that this function is correct and the test covers all codes.

Problem2

November 25, 2018

0.1 Problem 2

(b) My code of this function shows as follows:

```
In [9]: import numpy as np
```

```
def get_r(K, L, alpha, Z, delta):
    '''This function generates the interest rate or vector of interest rates'''
    ''' Firstly, check the type of inputs '''
    if type(K) != int and type(K) != float and type(K) != np.ndarray:
        raise TypeError('K should be a scalar or vector.')
    if type(L) != int and type(L) != float and type(L) != np.ndarray:
        raise TypeError('L should be a scalar or vector.')
    if type(alpha) != float or type(delta) != float:
        raise TypeError('Both alpha and delta should be float.')
    if type(Z) != int and type(Z) != float:
        raise TypeError('Z should be a integer or float.')

    '''Then, check the value of inputs'''
    if (type(K) != np.ndarray and K <= 0) or (type(K) == np.ndarray and not np.all(K >
0)):
        raise ValueError("K should be larger than zero")
    if (type(L) != np.ndarray and L <= 0) or (type(L) == np.ndarray and not np.all(L >
0)):
        raise ValueError("L should be larger than zero")
    if not 0 < alpha < 1:
        raise ValueError("Alpha should in the interval of (0,1).")
    if not Z > 0:
        raise ValueError("Z should be larger than zero")
    if not 0 <= delta < 1:
        raise ValueError("Delta should in the interval of (0,1).")

    '''Finally, make sure the length of K and L are the same'''
    if type(K) == np.ndarray and type(L) == np.ndarray:
        assert len(K) == len(L)

    ''' If the input meet all restrictions, then do the following calculation.'''
    r = alpha * Z * (L / K) ** (1 - alpha) - delta
    return r
```

```
In [10]: !py.test --cov
```

```
===== test session starts =====
platform win32 -- Python 3.7.1rc1, pytest-4.0.1, py-1.7.0, pluggy-0.8.0
rootdir: F:\\\\Perspective\\Assignment 7\\Problem 2, inifile:
plugins: cov-2.6.0
collected 244 items

test_r.py ... [ 25%]
```

```
... [ 54%]  
... [ 84%]  
...
```

```
[100%]
```

```
----- coverage: platform win32, python 3.7.1-candidate-1 -----
```

Name	Stmts	Miss	Cover
get_r.py	24	9	62%
test_r.py	29	0	100%
TOTAL	53	9	83%

```
===== 244 passed in 0.93 seconds =====
```

- (c) From the above result, we could see that some of codes in `get_r.py` is missing in the test. We may need a more comprehensive test to cover all cases for this function. However, until now, this function performs well.

3.

Watts' paper mainly talks about the importance of having a model, making assumptions explicit, causal inference, and prediction.

When the rational choice theory was introduced at the first time, it received criticisms from a wide range of experts in different fields. They argued that 'assumptions about the preferences, knowledge, and computational capabilities of the actors in question' are rather implausible or empirically invalid. What's more, predictions generated by this theory were also counter fact.¹

Watts argued about the main pitfall of using commonsense theories of action by denying the statement that 'understandability and causality were interchangeable'². To be specific, he further stated that 'the accuracy of an explanation towards some circumstances never guarantee the efficiency of using the same explanation in any generalizable causal mechanisms.' Therefore, these assumptions of commonsense theories were rather invalid and the epistemic conflation was indeed problematic.

To counter the problems of rational choice modeling and casual

¹ Watts, Duncan J., "Common Sense and Sociological Explanations," *American Journal of Sociology*, September 2014, 120 (2), P320

² Same paper, P327

explanation, Watts suggest ‘sociologists to rely more on experimental method, using counterfactual model of causal inference applied to nonexperimental data, and evaluating explanations by their ability to predict.’³

Even though this paper did a good job of relating causality to predication, I cannot agree with Watts’ disdain for theories of assumptions and mechanisms of modeling. Although model’s assumptions are somewhat unrealistic, they are actually helping us to reveal the sophisticated relationships behind the nature of real world. If the model includes all conditions in real world, there is no sense for us to use a model. What’s more, we have never said that the model is constant. With the deepening of research, we could relax some of the assumptions to make the model more similar to the real world. In addition, researcher’s cognitive process is from the shallower to the deeper. Having a rather unrealistic model could help us deeper our understanding of the research question. If we start with a complex and realistic model, we may find nothing in the process. Last, but not least, even though the prediction of our model might not correctly reflect the future performance of policies or market change, it could still be a helpful reference of future tendency and give us some hints that what factors would influence future performance or their relationships.

³ Same paper, P335-337

Reference

Watts, Duncan J., "Common Sense and Sociological Explanations,"
American Journal of Sociology, September 2014, 120 (2), 313-351