STUDY OF DEGREE AND LIMITATION OF THEORY OF PROBABILITY

MONIKA

ABSTRACT

In any irregular trial there is dependably vulnerability concerning whether a specific occasion will or won't happen. In the target sense the likelihood is what is upheld by various target contentions. Probabilities are numbers among O and 1 comprehensive, that mirror the odds of a physical occasion happening. There are diverse strategies by methods for which we can gauge the likelihood of an occasion. In this paper diverse parts of hypothesis of likelihood and its proverbial structure have been examined in detail and endeavor has been made to audit the degree and constraints of restrictive likelihood. Notwithstanding target understanding of likelihood there is a very extraordinary methodology known as abstract or individual likelihood. The fundamental favorable position of abstract likelihood is that it is constantly appropriate in a wide range of arbitrary trials.

Keywords:- adages of likelihood, restrictive likelihood, abstract or individual likelihood.

Introduction:- Likelihood is a part of Mathematics worried about the estimation of unsure occasions. In the target sense the likely is what is upheld by various target contentions. The established hypothesis of likelihood characterizes the numerical estimation of likelihood as the proportion of the quantity of good cases to the all-out number of similarly likely cases. The primary protest to this definition has been raised because of the expression "similarly likely cases". This definition would mean the decrease of all appropriation to uniform dissemination which isn't practical. The relative recurrence approach was proposed by R. Von misses. Likelihood for von misses is the "breaking point of relative recurrence in a system'. The possibility of likelihood is subsequently appropriate just to grouping of occasions; complaints have been raised on the ground that it is prohibited to apply scientific idea of point of confinement to an arrangement which by definition must not be liable to any Scientific guideline because of irregularity. We cannot by any stretch of the imagination touch base at the constraining estimation of relative recurrence, how vast the succession may be. The genuine likelihood of 'head' in a coin hurling may be ½, anyway in a specific succession of 1000 tosses may yield relative recurrence of "head" to be 0.4. However it is conceivable that another succession of 1000 tosses may yield relative recurrence of 'head' to be just 0.2. Do we need a million or a billion tosses before we can be sure that we can utilize relative recurrence to assess likelihood? It is preposterous to expect to discover the careful number of tosses so to make sure about the esteem allocated to likelihood.

Both the traditional and recurrence approaches have genuine disadvantages, the first in light of the fact that the word ' similarly likely' is obscure and the second on the grounds that the exceptionally substantial number included is ridiculous. As a result of these challenges, aphoristic way to deal with likelihood is created by A. Kolmogrov which relates likelihood hypothesis to the hypothesis of sets and proportion of genuine factors.

Axioms of Probability Give S a chance to mean an example space for a trial. On the off chance that S is discrete; all subsets relate to occasions, yet on the off chance that S is non-discrete just unique subsets called quantifiable compares to occasions. To every occasion An in the class C of occasions we partner a genuine number P(A), which is considered Probability of occasion An, if the accompanying sayings are fulfilled.

Axioms:

1. For each occasion An is the class C,
   $P(A) \geq O$
2. For Certain occasion S in the class C,
   $P(S) = 1$
3. For any number of totally unrelated occasions A_1, A_2-------------------- in the class C, $P(A_1 U A_2$----------------$)$ = $P(A_1) + P(A_2)$ +-----------------

With the assistance of these adages we can conclude a portion of the imperative outcomes.

- for every event A, $O \leq P(A) \leq 1$
  Thus probability is between 0 and 1
- The probability of impossible occasion is Zero
  $P(O)=0$
- The probability of Complement of A is given by P(A')
  $= 1 - P(A)$
- If $A= A_1 \cup A_2 \cup$------------$\cup A_n$, where A_1, A_2,--------- A_n

  are mutually exclusive occasion, then

  $P(A) = P(A) + P(A_2)$ +--------------$P(A_n)$

  If A= S(the whole sample space)

  then $P(A_1) + P(A_2)$ +------------$P(A_n) = 1$

- If A and B are any two occasion, then $P(AUB)=$
  $P(A)+ P(B) - P(A \cap B)$ Speculation to n occasions can likewise be made.

Conditional Probability:- We wish to consider a circumstance where information of event of an occasion impacts the event of another occasion. On the off chance that An and B are two occasions with the end goal that P (B)>0, the contingent likelihood of occasion A given B is meant by P(A/B). The occasion B is here and there called 'molding occasion' we characterize it as

$$P(A/B)= \frac{P(A\cap B)}{P(B)} \quad ; P(B)>0$$

or, $P(A\cap B)= P(A/B).\ P(B)$.

It P(A/B) = P(A) then we say that A and B are independent events. This is equivalent to $P(A\cap B)= P(A)\ P(B)$.

Bayes` Theorem: This hypothesis was detailed by Thomas Bayes in 1761. It manages the

Restrictive likelihood. Let A1, A2, A3 - A be gathering of totally unrelated occasions whose Union is S. If B is any event then for any of the event A_i, i=1, 2, 3------------n

$$P(Ai/B)= \frac{P(B/A_i)\ P(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P(B/A_i)\ P(A_i)}$$

Scope of the conditional Probability:-

We realize that nothing is outright in our temperament. All marvels are essentially a relative wonder. Our desire for future occasion depends on our past encounters. The likelihood is likewise a general wonder of questionable occasions. In this way we view all likelihood as restrictive probabilities. In this regard, the supposed total likelihood is a sort of restrictive likelihood with respect to the entire example space. Restrictive likelihood fulfills every one of the adages of likelihood and for fixed B, P(*/B) fulfills the accompanying maxims.

1. P(A/B)>0
2. P(B/B)=1
3. $P(A\cap C/B)= P(A/B).\ P(C/A\cap B)$. Provided $A\cap B$ is possible.
4. P(AUC/B)= P(A/B) + P(C/B)

It we put B = S(the whole sample space) in axiom (3) we get the definition of conditional probability.

Case study:-

1 Let P(A/B) and P(A/C) are two contingent probabilities characterized on the molding occasions B and C individually then P(A/B) and P(A/C) can't be looked at. For instance let us consider toss with a bite the dust let A= Four will show up, B= (1, 2, 4, 6) and C= (2, 4, 5). We locate the restrictive likelihood as pursues: P(A/B)= ¼ and P(A/C)= 1/3, yet we don't state that P(A/C)> P(A/B). For they are estimated concerning diverse molding occasions, consequently they should have distinctive probabilities immaterial to be thought about.

2 The set translation of the likelihood doest not characterizes restrictive likelihood sensibly. Give us a chance to consider again hurls with a pass on. Let A, B, C, are occasions with the end goal that A= (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), B=(3) and C= (1, 2, 3) We get the accompanying restrictive probabilities. P(A/B)=1 and P(C/B)=1 But it is a long way from coherent perspective that event of B makes almost

dependably, the impressively bigger set A. For one can never foresee about the family if just a single part is available.

3 In coin hurling test, we process the contingent likelihood P(H, T/H)=1, where H and T means 'head' and 'tail' individually. In any case, we see that it isn't valid in legitimate sense. For the event of 'head' not the slightest bit permits to anticipate that ' head and tail' will happen almost dependably. In the event that the coin is one-sided, the outcome will be far more detestable.

.

Subjective or Personal Probability:

Notwithstanding the translation of likelihood as target, there is a very unique elucidation as per which the likelihood of an announcement speak to a specific numerical proportion of an individual's level of confidence in the announcement. A strategy for computing an individual's level of faith in the event of an occasion is gotten by knowing how a lot of cash he is happy to hazard as a wager consequently of Rs. 100 state on the off chance that the occasion happens. On the off chance that the individual is sure about its event he can store upto Rs. 100 and even all things considered he isn't losing. Such an occasion is a certain occasion for the individual and the proportion of his level of conviction is the proportion of aggregate sum stored to aggregate sum offered and without a doubt occasion his level of conviction is 1. then again if the individual isn't happy to store even one rupee than it demonstrates that his complete mistrust in the event of occasion and proportion of his level of conviction is 0. The main prerequisite for the subject is that his conduct in wagering matters ought to be reasonable. By soundness, we imply that the subject is allowed to hazard any sum not surpassing Rs. 100 based on his level of conviction. Based on this emotional methodology, we can say that

1. The measure of degree of belief always lies between O and 1 inclusive which means that it is non-negative.
2. It is also additive. Let E be given situation and let there be two mutually exclusive alternatives E_1 and E_2 of E. So that $E= E_1+E_2$. Then naturally if the subject is willing to bet X rupees for the occurrence of E_1 in return of Rs. 100 he would be willing to bet 100-X for E_2, so that 1= degree of belief in E= $\frac{X}{100} + \frac{100-X}{100} = P_1+P_2$
   where P_1= degree of belief in E_1 and P_2= degree of belief in E_2.

This law can be effectively stretched out to limited number of option events. Thus abstract likelihood i.e., level of conviction of an individual complies with a similar law (expansion law, duplication law, Bayes law and so on.) as the standard likelihood in the limited case.

Conclusion:- There are numerous elucidations of hypothesis of likelihood by methods for which we can appraise the likelihood of arbitrary occasions. We likewise find that there are a few impediments of hypothesis of likelihood. In an established methodology the word 'similarly likely' is obscure correspondingly in a relative recurrence approach the word 'expansive number' is ridiculous. The deficiency of aphoristic methodology, as talked about for the ituation contemplates, is because of target idea of likelihood which depends on the hypothesis of sets. The oddities can be settled with the assistance of abstract likelihood which is a numerical proportion of individual's level of confidence in the announcement. Abstract likelihood complies with indistinguishable laws from the typical likelihood in the limited case, anyway it doesn't rely on the set hypothesis.

References:-

1. Kolmogorov, A.N., 'Foundation of Theory of Probability' Mac-Millan & Co. London (1956)
2. Von-Mises, R., 'Probability, Statistics and Truth', Mac-Millan & Co. (1957)
3. De Finetti, B., 'Theory of Probability', John wiley, Newyork (1974)
4. Murray R. Spiegal, J. schiller., 'Probability and Statistics' Tata Mc-graw Hill, New Delhi (2005)
5. Milton, J.S. & Arnold, J.C. 'Introduction to probability and statistics Tata Mc-graw Hill (2007)