Here is your background information, translatable into $B$, for this problem.

- **(Fact 1)** As a broad generalization (which you can verify empirically), statisticians tend to have shy personalities more often than economists do — let’s quantify this observation by assuming that 80% of statisticians are shy but the corresponding percentage among economists is only 15%.

- **(Fact 2)** Conferences on the topic of econometrics are almost exclusively attended by economists and statisticians, with the majority of participants being economists — let’s quantify this fact by assuming that 90% of the attendees are economists (and the rest statisticians).

Suppose that you (a physicist, say) go to an econometrics conference — you strike up a conversation with the first person you (haphazardly) meet, and find that this person is shy. The point of this problem is to show that the (conditional) probability $p$ that you’re talking to a statistician, given this data and the above background information, is only about 37%, which most people find surprisingly low, and to understand why this is the right answer.

Let $St = $ (person is statistician), $E = $ (person is economist), and $Sh = $ (person is shy).

(a) Identify (in the form of a proposition $B_1$, one of the elements of $B$) the most important assumption needed in this problem to permit its solution to be probabilistic; explain briefly. [5 points]

(b) Using the $St$, $E$ and $Sh$ notation, express the three numbers (80%, 15%, 90%) above, and the probability we’re solving for, in conditional probability terms, remembering to condition appropriately on $B$. [5 points]

(c) Briefly explain why calculating the desired probability is a good job for Bayes’s Theorem. [5 points]
(d) Briefly explain why the following expression is a correct use of Bayes’s Theorem in odds form in this problem. [5 points]

\[
\frac{P(St \mid Sh, B)}{P(E \mid Sh, B)} = \frac{P(St \mid B)}{P(E \mid B)} \cdot \frac{P(Sh \mid St, B)}{P(Sh \mid E, B)}
\]

(1) = (2) \cdot (3)

(e) Here are three terms that are relevant to the quantities in part (d) above:

- (Prior odds in favor of St over E given B)
- (Bayes factor in favor of St over E given the data and B)
- (Posterior odds in favor of St over E given the data and B)

Match these three terms with the numbers (1), (2), (3) in the second line of the equation in part (d), explaining briefly in each case. [5 points]

(f) Compute the three quantities in part (e), briefly explaining your reasoning, thereby demonstrating that the posterior odds value \( o \) in favor of St over E, given the data and B, is \( o = \frac{16}{27} \approx 0.593 \). [5 points]

(g) Use the expression \( p = \frac{o}{1+o} \) to show that the desired probability in this problem — the conditional probability that you’re talking to a statistician, given the data and the background information — is \( p = \frac{16}{43} \approx 0.372 \). [5 points]

(h) Someone says, “That probability can’t be right: 80% of statisticians are shy, versus 15% for economists, so your probability of talking to a statistician has to be over 50%.” Briefly explain why this line of reasoning is wrong, and why \( p \) should indeed be less than 50%. [5 points]