

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Math 54, Summer 2009, Lecture 4**  
**Quiz 9 Solution**

(1) Let  $V = \mathbb{P}_2$  with inner product  $\langle p, q \rangle = p(-1)q(-1) + p(0)q(0) + p(1)q(1)$ .

(a) If  $p_1(t) = t^2$  and  $p_2(t) = t$ , show that  $\{p_1, p_2\}$  is an orthogonal set. (4 points)

We just need to check that  $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle = 0$ . And indeed:

$$\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle = p_1(-1)p_2(-1) + p_1(0)p_2(0) + p_1(1)p_2(1) = 1 * -1 + 0 * 0 + 1 * 1 = 0.$$

(b) Let  $W = \text{Span}\{p_1, p_2\}$ , and compute  $\text{Proj}_W q$ , where  $q(t) = t + 1$ .

Since we have an orthogonal basis for  $W$ , we have

$$\text{Proj}_W q = \frac{\langle q, p_1 \rangle}{\langle p_1, p_1 \rangle} p_1 + \frac{\langle q, p_2 \rangle}{\langle p_2, p_2 \rangle} p_2.$$

We can now compute  $\langle q, p_1 \rangle = 0 * 1 + 1 * 0 + 2 * 1 = 2$ ,  $\langle p_1, p_1 \rangle = 1 * 1 + 0 * 0 + 1 * 1 = 2$ ,  $\langle q, p_2 \rangle = 0 * -1 + 1 * 0 + 2 * 1 = 2$  and  $\langle p_2, p_2 \rangle = -1 * -1 + 0 * 0 + 1 * 1 = 2$ . Thus  $\text{Proj}_W q = \frac{2}{2}t^2 + \frac{2}{2}t = t^2 + t$ .

(2) True or false? If it is true, say why. If it is false, provide a counterexample (3 points)

(a) If  $V = \mathbb{R}^4$ , an  $\{\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2\}$  and  $\{\vec{u}_3, \vec{u}_4\}$  are orthogonal subsets of  $V$ , then so is  $\{\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3, \vec{u}_4\}$ .

False. Consider  $\vec{u}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\vec{u}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\vec{u}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\vec{u}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ .

(b) If  $U$  is an orthogonal matrix and you rearrange the columns of  $U$ , then the resulting matrix is still orthogonal.

True. A matrix is orthogonal if and only if the columns are an orthonormal basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . If we reorder an orthonormal basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then it will still be an orthonormal basis.

(3) Suppose that  $A$  is a square matrix, and that  $\vec{x}_0$  is an eigenvector of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Suppose also that  $A\vec{x}_0$  is orthogonal to  $\vec{x}_0$ . What does this tell you about  $\lambda$ ? What does this tell you about  $A$ ? (2 points)

We have  $A\vec{x}_0 \cdot \vec{x}_0 = 0$  and  $A\vec{x}_0 = \lambda\vec{x}_0$ . Combining yields  $(\lambda\vec{x}_0) \cdot \vec{x}_0 = 0$ . Pulling the scalar out of the inner product, we get  $\lambda(\vec{x}_0 \cdot \vec{x}_0) = 0$ . Now,  $\vec{x} \cdot \vec{x} = 0$  only when  $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$ , but by definition eigenvectors cannot be  $\vec{0}$ . Thus  $\vec{x}_0 \cdot \vec{x}_0 \neq 0$ , so we must conclude that  $\lambda = 0$ . This means that  $A$  is not invertible.