# 36-402 Homework 3

James "Morgan" Hawkins

Friday Feb 10, 2023

### Problem 1

## Problem 1 (c)

```
rx <- function(b){
  if(b == 0){
    return(runif(1,0,4))
  }else{
    return(rnorm(1,-2,2))
  }
}

set.seed(99)
sample.z <- rbinom(10000,1,.5)
sample.x <-sapply(sample.z,rx)

mean(sample.x)</pre>
```

## [1] 0.01001486

```
sd(sample.x)<sup>2</sup>
```

## [1] 6.674159

We expect our sample to have a mean of 0 and a variance of 6.666. After drawing 10,000 smaples from the distribution of x we get a sample mean of .0100 and a sample variance of 6.6742. This reinfoces our answers for part a and b.

# Problem 4

Problem 4 (a)

```
1198/(1493+1198)
```

## [1] 0.4451877

```
557/(557+1278)
```

```
## [1] 0.3035422
```

44.52% of male applicants were accepted to Berkeley while only 30.35% of female applicants were accepted.

### Problem 4 (b)

```
ucb = data.frame(UCBAdmissions)
ucb
```

```
##
        Admit Gender Dept Freq
## 1 Admitted Male
                      A 512
## 2 Rejected
                      A 313
               Male
## 3 Admitted Female
                      Α
                          89
## 4 Rejected Female
                      Α
                         19
## 5 Admitted
                      B 353
               Male
## 6 Rejected
                      B 207
               Male
## 7 Admitted Female
                      В
                         17
## 8 Rejected Female
                      В
                          8
## 9 Admitted Male
                      C 120
## 10 Rejected
               Male
                      C 205
                      C 202
## 11 Admitted Female
## 12 Rejected Female
                      C 391
                      D 138
## 13 Admitted
               Male
## 14 Rejected
                      D 279
               Male
## 15 Admitted Female
                      D 131
## 16 Rejected Female
                      D 244
## 17 Admitted
               Male E 53
## 18 Rejected
               Male E 138
## 19 Admitted Female
                      Ε
                          94
## 20 Rejected Female
                      E 299
## 21 Admitted
               Male
                    F
                         22
## 22 Rejected
                      F 351
               Male
## 23 Admitted Female
                      F
                          24
                      F 317
## 24 Rejected Female
```

```
#print(temp.admiss)
print(d)
if(temp.admiss[[1]]>temp.admiss[[2]]){
   print("male higher")
}else{
   print("female higher")
}
```

```
## [1] "A"

## [1] "female higher"

## [1] "female higher"

## [1] "C"

## [1] "male higher"

## [1] "female higher"

## [1] "female higher"

## [1] "E"

## [1] "F"

## [1] "female higher"
```

The female acceptance rate is higher in 4 departments (A, B, D, F) and male acceptance rate is higher in 2 departments (C, E)

This can be considered a near example of simpson's paradox because our conclusion changes based on how we look at our data. In part A we looked at overall acceptance, but in part b we looked at the proportion of departments that accept male applicants at a higher rate.

## Problem 4 (c)

```
\begin{split} Y-accepted?\ bool \\ X-m/f\ [1=female] \\ Z-department-categorical \end{split}
```

```
calc_acceptance_rates <- function(df, department){
    df = df[df$Dept == department,]
    df = df[order(df$Admit),]
    df = df[order(df$Gender),]
    return(c(

        df[1,4]/(df[1,4] + df[2,4]),
        df[3,4]/(df[3,4] + df[4,4])

        ))
}
department.acceptances = data.frame("Gender" = c("Male","Female"))
for(d in unique(ucb$Dept)){
    #append(department.acceptances, c(calc_acceptance_rates(ucb,d)) )</pre>
```

```
department.acceptances[,paste("Z",d,sep = "=")] = calc_acceptance_rates(ucb,d)
}
department.acceptances

## Gender Z=A Z=B Z=C Z=D Z=E Z=F
## 1 Male 0.6206061 0.6303571 0.3692308 0.3309353 0.2774869 0.05898123
## 2 Female 0.8240741 0.6800000 0.3406408 0.3493333 0.2391858 0.07038123
```

 ${\it covariate - country \ of \ origin}$   ${\it treatment - drinks \ tea}$ 

outcome - if you live past 40

HW 3 a) E[x] = .5(0) + .5 E[x12. = .5E[x|z=-1] + .5E[x|z=1] = .5(z) + .5(-z) = (0 = E[x] V[x] = E[V[x|z]] + V[E[x|z]]= F[x2] - F[E[X12]2] + V[E[X12]] = .5(V[x|z=-1])+.5(V[x|z=1]) + V[ E[x|z]) = .5(4/3) + .5(4) + 4.5((2-0)2+(-2-0)2) = 8/3 +4 = (20/3) z)  $\Theta(x) = E[C(x)]$ = & Cubra = E[C(x)|x] c(x) and x are independent = [[y|x]]given X we know c(x) is the Jautcame by definition of c(x) = r(x)

selected the tetter tetter to the tetter to 3) a) A = E[(,] - E[(,] = (1/2(1) + 1/2(0)) - (1/2(0) + 1/2(1)) = 1/2-1/2 0 = 0 X = E[Y|X=1] - E[XX=0] = = P(Y=1 | X=1) - P(Y=@ X=0)  $P(Y=||X=1,Z=1) \cdot P(Z=1) + P(Y=1|X=1,Z=0) \cdot P(Z=0) - P(X=1) \cdot P(Z=1) - P(Y=1|X=0,Z=0) \cdot P(Z=0)$ P( + 1 2 - 1 = P(x=1|z=x) . P(z=1) + P(x=1|z=0). P(z=0) - P(y=1|z=1)P(z=1) - R(Y=1 | Z=0).P(Z=0) 2420-1302/12 1/2 + Q.1/2

b) x = E[Y|X=1] - E[Y|X=0]  $E[Y|X=1] = F[Y|X=1,Z=1] \cdot P(Z=1|X=1) + F[Y|X=1,Z=0]P(Z=0|X=1)$ = E[c(1) | z = 1] . P(z=1 | x=1) + E[c(1) | z=0) P(z=0 | x=1) =  $P(C(1)=1|Z=1) \cdot P(Z=1|X=1) + P(C(1)=1|Z=0) P(Z=0|X=1)$ P(2=1 \ X=1) E[y|x=0] = E[y|x=0, z=1] . P(z=1|x=0) + E[y|x=0, z=0] . P(z=0|x=0) = F[((0) | z=1] · P(z=1 | x=0) + F[((0) | z=0] · P(z=0 | x=0) = P(((0)=1 = 1) . P(z=1 | x=0) + P(((0)=1 | z=0) . P(z=2 | x=2) P(==1/x=0) + P(z=0|x=0) = 1-P(z=1|x=0) Q= EP(Z=1 | x=1) + P(Z=1 | x=0)-1

-6	
	1 N - D(7-11 V-1) , D( , 1
C	) X = P(Z=1   X=1) + P(Z=1   X=0)-1
-10	
	$= P(x=1 z=1) \cdot P(z=1)$
-0	P(x=1)
-0	
10	$= P(x=1 z=1) \cdot P(z=1)$
	$P(x= z=1)p(z=t) + P(x=0 z=0) \cdot P(z=0) = p(z=1) = p(z=0) = \sqrt{z}$
	DI TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE PART
	= P(x=1 z=1)
	P(x=1 z=1) + P(x=1 z=0)
-0	the second land out out a second designed
-0	* P(Z=1 X=9)
-0	= P(x=0 z=1) P(z=1)
-0	P(x=0)
	The transfer Warring to the terms of the second second
	= P(x=0 z=1) P(z=1)
	P(x=0 z=0) P(z=0) + P(x=0 z=1) P(z=1)
700	make the first mark the second
-0	= P(x=0 z=1)
-0	(1 - P(x=1 z=0)) + (1 - P(x=1 z=1))
-0	
-	d = P(x=1 z=1)
-	P(x=  z= ) + P(x=  z=0) = 2 - P(x=  z=0) - P(x=  z= )
9	
9 0	
3 0	
4	

	0)  X = P(z=1 x=1) + P(z=1 x=0) - 1
-	= P(z=1) + P(z=1)-1 if we randomly assign x,
	then X and Z are independent
	practical example of this would be if our binary covariate was a simple of this would be if our someone lived in england or not, our treatment was drinking tea, was and our outcome was whether they person lived past 40. If we don't randomly assign our treatment then we would find that people who drink tea live longer because english people tend to drink tea and also have a brigher life expectancy. However, if we randomly assign people to drink tea or not then this effective tead drinkers association would no longer exist because tea drinkers wouldn't be any more likely to be enghish.  e) if PLX=112=11= P(X=11Z=0)=.5 the x would equal q
-	