Probability exam answers

- 1 Problem 1
- 2 Problem 2
- 3 Problem 3

A financial market's value increases by 24% on good days and by 9% on normal days. It decreases by 12% during a bad day.

What is the <u>expected</u> growth of this market if each day is equally likely?

A financial market's value increases by 24% on good days and by 9% on normal days. It decreases by 12% during a bad day.

What is the <u>expected</u> growth of this market if each day is equally likely?

$$(\frac{1}{3})(.24) + (\frac{1}{3})(.09) - (\frac{1}{3})(.12) = .07$$
 (7% likelihood)

A financial market's value increases by 24% on good days and by 9% on normal days. It decreases by 12% during a bad day.

What is the <u>expected</u> growth of this market if each day is equally likely?

$$(\frac{1}{3})(.24) + (\frac{1}{3})(.09) - (\frac{1}{3})(.12) = .07$$
 (7% likelihood)

Would the market be more profitable if normal days were twice as likely as the two other (equally likely) events?

A financial market's value increases by 24% on good days and by 9% on normal days. It decreases by 12% during a bad day.

What is the $\underline{\mathsf{expected}}$ growth of this market if each day is equally likely?

$$(\frac{1}{3})(.24) + (\frac{1}{3})(.09) - (\frac{1}{3})(.12) = .07$$
 (7% likelihood)

Would the market be more profitable if normal days were twice as likely as the two other (equally likely) events?

$$(\frac{1}{4})(.24) + (\frac{1}{2})(.09) - (\frac{1}{4})(.12) = .075$$

Problem 1, Set 2: 11% and 10.5% (opposite conclusion).

Problem 2, Set 2, Question (a)

Assume a sample of 30 people $\underline{\text{randomly}}$ selected from a population where 10% failed to pay rent last month.

Calculate the <u>mean</u> and <u>variance</u> of failure to pay rent in the sample. Provide the formula for each.

Problem 2, Set 2, Question (a)

Assume a sample of 30 people $\underline{\text{randomly}}$ selected from a population where 10% failed to pay rent last month.

Calculate the <u>mean</u> and <u>variance</u> of failure to pay rent in the sample. Provide the formula for each.

The random variable X, for which P(X) designates failure to pay rent, follows a binomial distribution. Therefore:

$$\mu = np = (30)(.1) = 3$$

$$\sigma^2 = np(1-p) = (30)(.1)(.9) = 2.7$$

Problem 2, Set 1: $\mu = 5$, $\sigma = \sqrt{4} = 2$ (standard deviation).

Problem 2, Set 2, Question (b)

How likely is it to pick three people at random in this [random] sample and get only one who failed to pay rent? Provide the formula used.

For a single success k = 1 out of n = 3 independent trials, the probability of a random binomial variable X is $P(X = 1) = p(1 - p)^{n-1}$. Therefore:

$$(.9) \cdot (.9) \cdot (.1) = (.9)^2 (.1) = \frac{.81}{10} = .081$$

Problem 2, Set 1: $P(X = 1) = (.8)^{2}(.2) = .128$.

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (a)

A country usually emits 8 tons of carbon dioxide \emph{CO}_2 emissions per capita per year.

Annual trade sanctions can coerce this country into lowering its level of CO_2 emissions by s=25%. The probability of successful coercion through trade sanctions is observed to be p=20%.

How much CO_2 emissions is this country expected to produce on average?

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (a)

A country usually emits 8 tons of carbon dioxide CO_2 emissions per capita per year.

Annual trade sanctions can coerce this country into lowering its level of CO_2 emissions by s=25%. The probability of successful coercion through trade sanctions is observed to be p=20%.

How much CO_2 emissions is this country expected to produce on average?

Absent of coercion, $x_0 = 8$. With coercion, $x_1 = 8 - (8 \cdot .25) = 6$.

$$E(X) = \sum xP(x) = (.8)(8) + (.2)(6) = 6.4 + 1.2 = 7.6$$

Problem 3, Set 2: E(X) = (.8)(20) + (.2)(16) = 19.2.

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (b)

What level of success p should the trade sanctions reach for that country to emit less than 5 tons of CO_2 per capita on average?

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (b)

What level of success p should the trade sanctions reach for that country to emit less than 5 tons of CO_2 per capita on average?

The maximal level of CO_2 emissions per capita-year is $P(x_0) = 8$.

The minimal level of CO_2 emissions per capita-year is $P(x_1) = 6$.

It is impossible for the random variable x to reach less than $P(x_1) = 6$ on average. The probability of sanctions would have to exceed 100% for E(x) to fall below 6, which is inconceivable.

Problem 3, Set 2: same answer to Question (d).

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (c)

Find the level of sanction s at which that country emits less than 7 tons of CO_2 per capita on average.

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (c)

Find the level of sanction s at which that country emits less than 7 tons of CO_2 per capita on average.

To solve E(X) < 7, let x be the level of emissions after trade sanctions, with s = 1 - x the level of sanctions.

$$(.2)(8x) + (.8)(8) < 7$$

$$\frac{8x}{5} < 7 - 6.4 = .6$$
 therefore $x < \frac{.6 \cdot 5 = 3}{8} = .375$

Sanctions need to be greater than 1-x=.625 (62.5%) for average emissions to drop at 7 or less.

Problem 3, Set 2, Question (b): $s = 1 - x > \frac{1}{2}$.

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (d)

Alternately, if the level of sanctions cannot be increased, how large should p be to attain that same maximum level of CO_2 emissions?

Problem 3, Set 1, Question (d)

Alternately, if the level of sanctions cannot be increased, how large should p be to attain that same maximum level of CO_2 emissions?

Solving E(x) < 7 with x = p the probability of sanctions:

$$(x)(6) + (1-x)(8) < 7$$

$$-2x < -1$$
 therefore $x > \frac{1}{2}$

If the sanctions applied more than 50% of years, the country would emit less than 7 tons per capita-year.

Problem 3, Set 2, Question (c): same answer.