Solutions to Midterm Exam

ECON 337901 - Financial Economics — Peter Ireland
Boston College, Department of Economics — Spring 2026

Due Tuesday, March 24

1. Futures Pricing

The stock sells for $q^s = 6$ at $t = 0$ and pays off $P^G = 10$ in the good state at $t = 1$ and $P^B = 4$ in the bad state at $t = 1$. The bond sells for $q^b = 0.9$ at $t = 0$ and pays off one no matter what at $t = 1$. The futures contract sells for q^F at $t = 0$ and pays off $P^G - F = 10 - F$ in the good state at $t = 1$ and $P^B - F = 4 - F$ in the bad state at $t = 1$.

a. To begin, consider using a portfolio consisting of s shares of stock and b bonds to replicate the payoffs on the futures contract in the good and bad states. The values of s and b must satisfy

$$10s + b = 10 - F$$

and

$$4s + b = 4 - F.$$

Subtract the second equation from the first to get

$$6s = 6,$$

which implies that $s = 1$. Then substitute this solution for s into either equation to get $b = -F$. Since the portfolio with $s = 1$ and $b = -F$ costs $q^s - Fq^b$, no arbitrage across all markets implies that the price of the futures contract must be

$$q^F = q^s - Fq^b = 6 - 0.9F.$$

b. In practice, the price quoted for futures contracts corresponds to the delivery price F that makes $q^F = 0$. In light of the answer to part (b), this delivery price will be

$$F = 6/0.9 = 20/3 = 6.67.$$

2. Option Pricing

The prices and payoffs for the stock and bond are the same as in question 1. The call option with $K = 6$ sells for q_6^C at $t = 0$ and pays off $P^G - K = 10 - 6 = 4$ in the good state at $t = 1$ and zero in the bad state at $t = 1$. The call option with $K = 7$ sells for q_7^C at $t = 0$ and pays off $P^G - K = 10 - 7 = 3$ in the good state at $t = 1$ and zero in the bad state at $t = 1$. The digital option with $K = 6$ sells for q_6^D at $t = 1$ and pays off one in the good state at $t = 1$ and zero in the bad state at $t = 1$.

a. Consider using a portfolio consisting of s shares of stock and b bonds to replicate the payoffs on the call option with $K = 6$ in the good and bad states. The values of s and b must satisfy

$$10s + b = 4$$

and

$$4s + b = 0.$$

Subtract the second equation from the first to get

$$6s = 4,$$

or $s = 2/3$. Then substitute this solution for s into either equation to get $b = -8/3$. Since the portfolio with $s = 2/3$ and $b = -8/3$ costs

$$(2/3)q^s - (8/3)q^b = (2/3) \times 6 - (8/3) \times 0.9 = 4 - 2.4 = 1.6,$$

no arbitrage across all markets implies that the price of the call must be $q_6^C = 1.6$.

b. Likewise, consider using a portfolio consisting of s shares of stock and b bonds to replicate the payoffs on the call option with $K = 7$ in the good and bad states. The values of s and b must now satisfy

$$10s + b = 3$$

and

$$4s + b = 0.$$

Subtract the second equation from the first to get

$$6s = 3$$

or $s = 1/2$. Then substitute this solution for s into either equation to get $b = -2$. Since the portfolio with $s = 1/2$ and $b = -2$ costs

$$(1/2)q^s - 2q^b - = (1/2) \times 6 - 2 \times 0.9 = 3 - 1.8 = 1.2.$$

no arbitrage across all markets implies that the price of the put must be $q_7^C = 1.2$.

c. Similarly, consider using a portfolio consisting of s shares of stock and b bonds to replicate the payoffs on the digital option with $K = 6$ in the good and bad states. The values of s and b must satisfy

$$10s + b = 1$$

and

$$4s + b = 0.$$

Subtract the second equation from the first to get

$$6s = 1,$$

or $s = 1/6$. Then substitute this solution for s into either equation to get $b = -2/3$. Since the portfolio with $s = 1/6$ and $b = -2/3$ costs

$$(1/6)q^s - (2/3)q^b = (1/6) \times 6 - (2/3) \times 0.9 = 1 - 0.6 = 0.4,$$

no arbitrage across all markets implies that the price of the digital option must be $q_6^D = 0.4$.

d. Finally, consider the call spread that takes a long position in the call with $K = 6$ and a short position in the call with $K = 7$. In the good state at $t = 1$, the long position in the call with $K = 6$ yields a payoff of 4, but the short position in the call with $K = 7$ requires a payment of 3. On net, therefore, the call spread pays off one dollar in the good state at $t = 1$. In the bad state at $t = 1$, both calls are out of the money; hence, the value of the call spread is zero. The cash flows from the call spread, therefore, are exactly the same as those from the digital option. No arbitrage then requires that the net cost of the call spread,

$$q_6^C = q_7^C = 1.6 - 1.2 = 0.4,$$

should be the same as the price of the digital option. Indeed, part (c) already shows that $q_6^D = 0.4$.

3. Dynamic Hedging

The binomial tree for the price of the stock is



and the binomial tree for the price of the bond is



We want to use the data from these trees to "price" a call option that gives the holder the right, but not the obligation, to buy a share of stock at the strike price $K = 100$ at $t = 2$. The binominal tree for this option is



a. To begin the process of "backwards recursion," start in the good state at $t = 1$. Looking ahead to $t = 2$, the stock price may rise to $P_2^G = 160$ in the good state or fall to $P_2^M = 120$ in the medium state. Either way, the call will be in the money, worth $V_2^G = 60$ in the good state and $V_2^M = 20$ in the medium state. The bond is worth 100 no matter what. Therefore, if s is the number of shares of stock and b the number of bonds required to form the portfolio that replicates the option's payoffs in both states, these values must satisfy

$$160s + 100b = 60$$

and

$$120s + 100b = 20.$$

The easiest way to solve this system of equation is to subtract the second equation from the first to eliminate the term involving b; the result shows that

$$40s = 40$$

or $s = 1$. Plugging this solution for s back into either of the two original equations and solving for b yields $b = -1$. No arbitrage requires the price V_1^G in the good state at $t = 1$ to equal the cost of assembling this portfolio. Since $P_1^G = 130$ is the stock price and $Q_1^G = 90$ is the bond price in the good state at $t = 1$, we now know that

$$V_1^G = 130 - 90 = 40.$$

b. Next, let's move down to the bad state at $t = 1$. Looking ahead to $t = 2$, the stock price may rise to $P_2^M = 120$ in the medium state or fall to $P_2^B = 80$ in the bad state. Now, the call will be in the money, worth $V_2^M = 20$, in the medium state, but out of the money, worth $V_2^B = 0$, in the bad state. The bond is again worth 100 no matter what. Now for the portfolio that replicates the option's payoffs, s and b must satisfy

$$120s + 100b = 20$$

and

$$80s + 100b = 0.$$

Again, it's most convenient to subtract the second equation from the first to eliminate b and solve for

$$40s = 20$$

or $s = 1/2$. Now use either of the two original equations to find $b = -2/5$. No arbitrage requires the price V_1^B in the bad state at $t = 1$ to equal the cost of assembling this portfolio. Since $P_1^B = 90$ is the stock price and $Q_1^B = 90$ is the bond price in the bad state at $t = 1$, we now know that

$$V_1^B = 90 \times (1/2) - 90 \times (2/5) = 45 - 36 = 9.$$

c. Finally, let's move back to $t = 0$. We've already found that the option will be worth $V_1^G = 40$ in the good state at $t = 1$ and $V_1^B = 9$ in the bad state at $t = 1$. We also know from the original binomial trees that the stock price will be $P_1^G = 130$ in the good state at $t = 1$ and $P_1^B = 90$ in the bad state at $t = 1$. The bond is worth 90 no matter what. Now for the portfolio that replicates the option's payoffs, s and b must satisfy

$$130s + 90b = 40$$

and

$$90s + 90b = 9.$$

Again, it's most convenient to subtract the second equation from the first to eliminate b and solve for

$$40s = 31$$

or $s = 0.775$. Now use either of the two original equations to find $b = -0.675$. No arbitrage requires the price V_0 at $t = 0$ to equal the cost of assembling this portfolio. Since $P_0 = 100$ is the stock price and $Q_0^B = 80$ is the bond price at $t = 0$, we now know that

$$V_0 = 100 \times 0.775 - 80 \times 0.675 = 23.5.$$

Before moving on to problem 4, let's view the dynamic hedging strategy required to match the option's payoffs from the perspective of a trader, moving forwards instead of backwards in "real time." At $t = 0$, the solution to part (c) from above shows that this trader must buy $s = 0.775$ shares of stock to replicate the option's payoffs moving from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$.

Now, suppose that the good state arrives at $t = 1$. The solution to part (a) from above shows that, even as the stock price rises from $P_0 = 100$ to $P_1^G = 130$, the trader must increase his or her holdings of the stock to $s = 1$ share. Suppose, on the other hand, that the bad state arrives at $t = 1$. The solution to part (b) from above shows that, even as the stock price falls from $P_0 = 100$ to $P_1^B = 90$, the trader must decrease his or her holdings of the stock to $s = 1/2$ shares.

Thus, a trader using dynamic hedging to track the value of a stock option will have to buy shares when the stock price is rising and sell shares when the stock price is falling. These trading strategies can sometimes work to amplify large stock price movements, as with GameStop in early 2021. Similar strategies have also been blamed for part of the "Black Monday" stock market crash on October 19, 1987, when the S&P 500 stock index declined by more than 20 percent on one day.

4. Using Options to Infer Contingent Claims Prices

Douglas Breeden and Robert Litzenberger showed how options on the Standard & Poor's 500 stock index could be used to infer the prices of contingent claims in the real world. To do this, they assumed that there are N states of the world, corresponding to different levels of the S&P500, with

$$P^1 < P^2 < \ldots < P^N$$

and

$$P^{i+1} = P^i + \delta$$

for some $\delta > 0$. That is, better states of the world correspond to higher levels of the S&P 500, with levels of the S&P 500 arranged on a grid with δ points between each entry.

Next, Breeden and Litzenberger showed that if one constructs a "butterfly" portfolio of call options by buying one call on the S&P 500 with strike price P^{i-1}, writing (selling short) two calls on the S&P 500 with strike price P^i, and buying one call on the S&P 500 with strike price P^{i+1}, then the resulting portfolio will pay off δ dollars in state i, when the S&P 500 is at level $P = P^i$, and zero otherwise. Thus, if q_o^i denotes the price of a call option with strike price P^i, no arbitrage implies that the price q_{cc}^i of a contingent claim that pays off one dollar in state i and zero otherwise can be computed as

$$q_{cc}^i = (1/\delta)(q_o^{i-1} + q_o^{i+1} - 2q_o^i).$$

The table below shows prices on Friday, February 27, 2026 (just before spring break, when the S&P 500 itself stood at 6875) of call options on the S&P 500 expiring on Friday, May 15, 2026 (just before graduation day) for seven strike prices on a grid that sets $\delta = 100$, taken from the "quotes dashboard" on the website of the Chicago Board Options Exchange:

S&P 500 Call Option Prices

May 15, 2026 Expiration

Strike Price	Option Price
$K = P^1 = 6700$	$q_o^1 = 350$
$K = P^2 = 6800$	$q_o^2 = 277$
$K = P^3 = 6900$	$q_o^3 = 210$
$K = P^4 = 7000$	$q_o^4 = 150$
$K = P^5 = 7100$	$q_o^5 = 100$
$K = P^6 = 7200$	$q_o^6 = 62$
$K = P^7 = 7300$	$q_o^7 = 35$

Besides the genius that lies behind the basic idea, what is truly impressive about Breeden and Litzenberger's results is how easy they are to apply in practice: we can exploit the similarity between option payoffs and contingent claims payoffs to infer contingent claims prices from options prices without having to solve any system of equations!

In particular, to price a contingent claim for the state in which the S&P 500 is at $P^2 = 6800$ on May 15, we only need to plug the relevant options prices into the formula and compute

$$q_{cc}^2 = (1/100)(350 + 210 - 2 \times 277) = 0.06.$$

Likewise, for the states in which the S&P 500 is at $P^3 = 6900$, $P^4 = 7000$, $P^5 = 7100$, and $P^6 = 7200$:

$$q_{cc}^3 = (1/100)(277 + 150 - 2 \times 210) = 0.07,$$

$$q_{cc}^4 = (1/100)(210 + 100 - 2 \times 150) = 0.10,$$

$$q_{cc}^5 = (1/100)(150 + 62 - 2 \times 100) = 0.12,$$

and

$$q_{cc}^6 = (1/100)(100 + 35 - 2 \times 62) = 0.11.$$

This small set of calculations illustrates how we can use option prices to infer contingent claims prices in the real world. As S&P options trade with many strike prices above and below those shown in the table, we can use the same procedure to infer contingent claims prices for even better or worse states of the world. And since S&P 500 options also trade with strike prices at intervals as small as 5 points, we can use the same procedure to price contingent claims for large number of states intermediate to those considered here.