

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE STUDENT:**

1. You have exactly 1 hour to complete the exam.
2. There are 5 pages including this cover sheet, and 14 questions.
3. Each question is worth 7 points, which means that everyone gets a bonus of two points.  
**Please circle the letter of the correct answer for each question.**
4. Do not discuss or provide any information to anyone concerning any of the questions on this exam or your solutions until I post the solutions.
5. The only materials you may use are a calculator, an 8 1/2 by 11 inch formula sheet of your own making (with writing on one side only), and a copy of the common distributions on pp. 253-258 of Hoff. **Do not use the textbook or class notes.**

I attest that I spent no more than 1 hour to complete the exam. I used only the allowed materials as described above. I did not receive assistance from anyone during the taking of this exam.

**Student's Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PROCTOR:**

- (1) Record the time at which the student starts the exam: \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) Record the time at which the student ends the exam: \_\_\_\_\_
- (3) Immediately after the student completes the exam, please scan the exam to a .pdf file and have the student upload it to WebAssign.
- (4) Collect all portions of this exam at its conclusion. Do not allow the student to take any portion of the exam.
- (5) Please keep these materials until October 15, 2014, at which time you may either dispose of them or return them to the student.

I attest that the student has followed all the INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE STUDENT listed above and that the exam was scanned into a pdf and uploaded to WebAssign in my presence.

**Proctor's Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

1. To a frequentist, data sets that might have been observed but were not are

- (a) irrelevant.
- (b) relevant, but do not affect how he or she does statistical inference.
- (c) used to determine HPD regions.
- (d) the basis for defining measures of uncertainty.
- (e) the basis for Google's innovative analytics methods.

2. The posterior density for  $\theta$  in a certain binomial experiment is known to have the form

$$\pi(\theta|y) = C\theta^{19}(1 - \theta)^{13}I_{(0,1)}(\theta),$$

where  $C$  is a constant. Given that  $\Gamma(n + 1) = n!$  for all integers  $n \geq 1$ , the value of  $C$

- (a) is  $(33 \cdot 32 \cdots 20)/13!$ .
- (b) is  $13!/(33 \cdot 32 \cdots 20)$ .
- (c) is  $(31 \cdot 30 \cdots 19)/12!$ .
- (d) cannot be determined from the information given.
- (e) is quite small given the current state of the US economy.

3. Suppose we are to observe a random sample from the density

$$f(y|\theta) = (\theta + 1)2^{-(\theta+1)}y^\theta I_{(0,2)}(y),$$

where  $\theta$  is an unknown parameter that can be any positive number. The Jeffrey's noninformative prior for  $\theta$  is

- (a) proportional to  $(\theta + 1)^{-1}I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta)$  and improper.
- (b) proportional to  $(\theta + 1)^{-1}I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta)$  and proper.
- (c) proportional to  $\theta^{-1}I_{(0,\infty)}(\theta)$  and improper.
- (d) not attainable from the information given.
- (e) impossible to determine given the amount of sleep I had last night.

4. The posterior odds ratio is

- (a) the same as the Bayes factor.
- (b) equivalent to the likelihood ratio when testing two simple hypotheses against each other.
- (c) never used in Bayesian hypothesis testing.
- (d) the ratio of posterior probabilities of two hypotheses.
- (e) derisively referred to as the "posterior odd ratio" by scornful frequentists.

5. Suppose we have observed a random sample  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  from some distribution depending on unknown parameters. The next value we will observe is  $Y_{n+1}$ . Consider the density  $m(y_{n+1}|y_1, \dots, y_n)$ , which is the conditional density of  $Y_{n+1}$  given  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ . This density is useful

- (a) for determining the mode of the posterior density.
- (b) only for model checking.
- (c) only for predicting  $Y_{n+1}$ .
- (d) both for model checking and predicting  $Y_{n+1}$ .
- (e) for predicting when donkies will fly.

6. Some people have criticized Bayesian statistics as being too subjective. This criticism can be countered by saying

- (a) that subjectivity is ok in certain circumstances.
- (b) that one may use a noninformative prior, which is not subjective.
- (c) both (a) and (b).
- (d) that priors are inherently *objective*.
- (e) yo, frequentists, get over it!

7. The random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  have the following joint density:

$$f(x, y) = \phi(x) \frac{1}{2} \phi\left(\frac{y}{2}\right) \quad \text{for all } x \text{ and } y,$$

where  $\phi$  denotes the standard normal density function. These two random variables are

- (a) identically distributed.
- (b) exchangeable but not independent.
- (c) independent but not exchangeable.
- (d) both independent and exchangeable.
- (e) BFF.

**8.** In a binomial experiment that uses a  $\text{beta}(a, b)$  prior for the unknown success proportion, a nice interpretation of  $a$  and  $b$  is that

- (a)  $a$  is like the number of failures in a prior study with  $a + b$  trials.
- (b)  $a$  is like the number of successes in a prior study with  $a + b$  trials.
- (c)  $a/b$  is a prior estimate of the success proportion.
- (d)  $a - b$  is a prior estimate of the difference between the success and failure proportions.
- (e) they have been to every Aggie home game since 1978.

**9.** An investigator uses a normal distribution as her prior for an unknown parameter  $\theta$ . She observes a single set of data and finds that the *posterior* distribution of  $\theta$  is also a normal distribution. In this case

- (a) it is definitely true that the normal distribution is a conjugate family for the investigator's likelihood.
- (b) it is definitely *not* true that the normal distribution is a conjugate family for the investigator's likelihood.
- (c) it might be true that the normal distribution is a conjugate family for the investigator's likelihood.
- (d) her prior is noninformative.
- (e) the investigator will undoubtedly receive the Nobel prize.

**10.** A nice property of the posterior distribution is that it

- (a) will always coincide strongly with the investigator's prior opinions.
- (b) will never be strongly affected by the prior distribution.
- (c) depends on the data only through sufficient statistics.
- (d) satisfies both (b) and (c).
- (e) makes for great dinner conversation when rump roast is on the menu.

**11.** Given  $\theta$ , the observations  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are independent and identically distributed Poisson( $\theta$ ) random variables. A gamma(2, 1) prior is to be used for  $\theta$ . Suppose that  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are observed to be 0 and 5, respectively. An expression for the posterior probability that  $\theta$  is closer to 5 than to 0

- (a) is  $(3^7/\Gamma(7)) \int_{2.5}^{\infty} \theta^6 e^{-3\theta} d\theta$ .
- (b) is  $(3^7/\Gamma(7)) \int_0^{2.5} \theta^6 e^{-3\theta} d\theta$ .
- (c) is  $\int_{2.5}^{\infty} \theta^6 e^{-3\theta} d\theta$ .
- (d) cannot be obtained from the information given.
- (e) cannot be obtained from the information given unless your name is Jim Berger.

**12.** Most Bayesians agree that an improper prior distribution is ok to use only if

- (a) it is a Jeffreys prior.
- (b) the corresponding posterior is proper.
- (c) the corresponding posterior is noninformative.
- (d) it is uniform over the entire parameter space.
- (e) those in the room are not overly sensitive.

**13.** Suppose that  $Y_f$  and  $Y$  are independent given  $\theta$ . To generate data from the posterior predictive distribution of  $Y_f$  given  $Y = y$

- (a) one must have an explicit expression for  $m(y_f|y)$ .
- (b) it is necessary to know how to generate values from the posterior and values from the distribution of  $Y_f$  given  $\theta$ .
- (c) it suffices to know how to generate values from the posterior and values from the distribution of  $Y_f$  given  $\theta$ .
- (d) one needs to know how to draw pairs  $(y, \theta)$  from the joint distribution of  $Y$  and  $\theta$ .
- (e) one should draw numbers randomly from a hat.

**14.** Ten independent and identically distributed observations are obtained from a gamma( $1, 1/\theta$ ) density. An inverse-gamma( $1, 1$ ) prior is used for  $\theta$ . The ten observations turned out to have sample mean 4.7. A reasonable Bayesian point estimate for  $\theta$

- (a) is 4.8.
- (b) is 4.
- (c) is either (a) or (b).
- (d) cannot be determined from the information given.
- (e) cannot be computed unless one has access to powerful parallel computing.