

**MAT-42106 Applied Logics.**

**Partial examination 1. 17.11.2010 in Lectur room SJ202.**

**Esko Turunen**

**Problem 1.**

Assume we are observing children who have an allergic reaction to, say, tomato, apple, orange, cheese or milk. These observations are presented in the following table:

Child	Tomato	Apple	Orange	Cheese	Milk
Anna	1	1	0	1	1
Aina	1	1	1	0	0
Naima	1	1	1	1	1
Rauha	0	1	1	0	1
Kai	0	1	0	1	1
Kille	1	1	0	0	1
Lempi	0	1	1	1	1
Ville	1	0	0	0	0
Ulle	1	1	0	1	1
Dulle	1	0	1	0	0
Dof	1	0	1	0	1
Kinge	0	1	1	0	1
Laade	0	1	0	1	1
Koff	1	1	0	0	1
Olvi	0	1	1	1	1

Construct the 4-ft contingency table for  $\phi = \text{Apple}$  and  $\psi = \text{Cheese}$ . Is

$$v(\phi \approx \psi) = \text{TRUE}$$

in this model, where  $\approx$  is basic implication,  $p = 0.7$  and base = 6?

**Problem 2.**

Let  $M$  and  $N$  be two models that generate the following two four-fold tables.

M	$\psi$	$\neg\psi$	N	$\psi$	$\neg\psi$
$\phi$	$a_1$	$b_1$	$\phi$	$a_2$	$b_2$
$\neg\phi$	$c_1$	$d_1$	$\neg\phi$	$c_2$	$d_2$

Under which conditions  $N$  is (a) associationally (b) implicational better than  $M$ ? (c) Define the truth condition of Basic equivalence quantifiers.

**Problem 3.**

Is  $\phi$  a logical consequences of a set  $\{-\psi \vee \phi, \psi \wedge \phi\}$ ?

**Problem 4.**

Prove that  $\Sigma$ -double implication quantifiers are associational.

**Problem 5.**

(a) Why are rules of inference useful in GUHA-logic framework? (b) Let  $\phi(x)$ ,  $\psi(x)$ ,  $\chi(x)$  be formulae, and let  $\approx$  be an implicational quantifier. Prove that

$$\frac{[\phi \wedge \neg\chi] \approx \psi}{\phi \approx [\chi \vee \psi]}$$

is a sound rule of inference.