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## A2: Exploratory Data Analysis

Use Tableau to formulate $\&$ answer questions
First steps
Step 1: Pick domain \& data
Step 2: Pose questions
Step 3: Profile data
Iterate as needed
Create visualizations
Interact with data
Refine questions


Author a report
Screenshots of most insightful views (10+)
Include titles and captions for each view
Due before class on Jan 27, 2020

## Exploratory Data Andysis
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## The Rise of Statistics (1900-1950s)

Rise of formal methods in statistics and social science - Fisher, Pearson, ...

Litłle innovation in graphical methods

A period of application and popularization

Graphical methods enter textbooks, curricula, and mainstream use
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## Dafa Wrangling

| Bureau of Justice Statistics - Data online http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reported crime in Alabama |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { year } \\ & 2004 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Population } \\ & 4525375 \quad 4029.3 \end{aligned}$ | Property 987 2732.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rate } \\ & 309.9 \end{aligned}$ | Burglary rate | Larceny-theft rate | Motor vehicle theft rate |
| 2005 | 45483273900 | 955.82656 | 289 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 45990303937 | 968.92645 .1 | 322.9 |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 46278513974.9 | 980.22687 | 307.7 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 46619004081.9 | $1080.7 \quad 2712.6$ | 288.6 |  |  |  |
| Reported crime in Alaska |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { rear } \\ & 2004 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Population } \\ & 657755 \quad 3370.9 \end{aligned}$ | Property crime <br> $573.6 \quad 2456.7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rate } \\ & 340.6 \end{aligned}$ | Burglary rate | Larceny-theft rate | Motor vehicle theft rate |
| 2005 | 6632533615 | 622.82601 | 391 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 6700533582 | $615.2 \quad 2588.5$ | 378.3 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2007 \\ & 2008 \end{aligned}$ | 683478 3373.9 <br> 686293 2928.3 | $\begin{array}{ll} 538.9 & 2480 \\ 470.9 & 2219.9 \end{array}$ | 355.1 237.5 |  |  |  |
| Reported crime in Arizona |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Population | Property crime | rate | Burglary rate | Larceny-theft rate | Motor vehicle theft rate |
| 2005 | 59530074827. | $946.2{ }^{9958}{ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 922.5 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 61663184741.6 | 953.2874 .1 | 914.4 |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 63387554502.6 | 935.42780 .5 | 786.7 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 65001804087.3 | 894.22605 .3 | 587.8 |  |  |  |
| Reported crime in Arkansas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { year } \\ & 2004 \end{aligned}$ | population <br> 27500004033.1 | Property crime 1096.42699 .7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rate } \\ & 237 \end{aligned}$ | Burglary rate | Larceny-theft rate | Motor vehicle theft rate |
| 2005 | 27757084068 | 1085.12720 | 262 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 28108724021.6 | $1154.4 \quad 2596.7$ | 270.4 |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 28347973945.5 | $1124.4 \quad 2574.6$ | 246.5 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 28553903843.7 | $1182.7 \quad 2433.4$ | 227.6 |  |  |  |
| Reported crime in California |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| year | Population 35842038 | Property crime $3423.9 \quad 686.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rate } \\ & 2033.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Burg7ary rate } \\ & 704.8 \end{aligned}$ | Larceny-theft rate | Motor vehicle theft rate |
| 2005 | 36154147 | 3321 692.9 | 1915 | 712 |  |  |
| 2006 | 36457549 | 3175.2676 .9 | 1831.5 | 666.8 |  |  |
| 2007 | $\begin{aligned} & 36553215 \\ & 36756666 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 3032.6 & 648.4 \\ 2940.3 & 646.8 \end{array}$ | 1784.1 | 600.2 523.8 |  |  |
| Reported crime in colorado |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { year } \\ & 2004 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Population } \\ & 46018213918.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { property crime } \\ & 717.3 \text { 2679.5 } \end{aligned}$ | rate 521.6 | Burglary rate | Larceny-theft rate | Motor vehicle theft rate |
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| DataWrangler |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ransform Script Lheet beat |  |  |  |
| Split data repeatedly on newline isto rows | (1) Year | - extract | (1) Property_crime rate |
|  | 0 Reported crime in Alaband | Alabana |  |
|  | 12004 |  | 4029.3 |
| Split split repeatedly on \% | 22005 |  | 3900 |
|  | 32006 |  | 3937 |
| Promote row 0 to header | 42007 |  | 3974.9 |
| Delete empty rows | 52008 |  | 4881.9 |
|  | 6 Reported crime in Alaska | Alaska |  |
|  | $72004$ |  | 3370.9 |
|  | 82005 |  | 3615 |
|  | 92006 |  | 3582 |
| Extract from Year after 7 n ' | 102007 |  | 3373.9 |
|  | 112008 |  | 2928.3 |
| Extract from Year after ' in ' | 12 Reported crime in Arizona | Arizona |  |
| Cut from Year atter 'in' | 132004 |  | 5073.3 |
|  | 142005 |  | 4827 |
| Cut from Year atter ' in * | 152006 |  | 4741.6 |
|  | 162007 |  | 4502.6 |
| 5 plat Year atter 'in ' | 172088 |  | 4887.3 |
| Split Year atter ' in * | 18 geported crime in Arkansos | Arkansas |  |
|  | $192004$ |  | 4633.1 |
|  | 202005 |  | 4668 |
|  | 212006 |  | 4021.6 |
|  | 222007 |  | 3945.5 |
|  | 232008 |  | 3843.7 |
|  | 24 Reported crime in Collfornia | californte |  |
|  | 252004 |  | 3423.9 |
|  | 262005 |  | 3321 |
|  | 272006 |  | 3175.2 |
|  | 282007 |  | 3032.6 |
|  | 292008 |  | 2940.3 |
|  | 30 semactad crime in falaradn. | Colacodo |  |

## Data "Wrangling"

One often needs to manipulate data prior to analysis. Tasks include reformatting, cleaning, quality assessment, and integration

Some approaches:
Writing custom scripts
Manual manipulation in spreadsheets
Trifacta Wrangler: http://trifacta.com/products/wrangler/ Google Refine: hitp://openrefine.org

## How to gauge the quality of a visualization?

"The first sign that a visualization is good is that it shows you a problem in your data...
...every successful visualization that l've been involved with has had this stage where you realize, "Oh my God, this data is not what I thought it would be!" So already, you've discovered something."

- Martin Wattenberg
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## Visualize Friends by School?



## Data Quality Hurdles

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Missing Data } & \text { no measurements, redacted, ...? } \\
\text { Erroneous Values } & \text { misspelling, outliers, ...? } \\
\text { Type Conversion } & \text { e.g., zip code to lat-lon } \\
\text { Entity Resolution } & \text { diff. values for the same thing? } \\
\text { Data Integration } & \text { effort/errors when combining data } \\
\text { LESSON: Anticipate problems with your data. } \\
\text { Many research problems around these issues! }
\end{array}
$$

## Analysis Example: Effectiveness of Antibiotics

## Antibiotic Effectiveness: The Data

| Genus of Bacteria | String |
| :--- | :--- |
| Species of Bacteria | String |
| Antibiotic Applied | String |
| Gram-Staining | Pos / Neg |
| Min. Inhibitory Concent. (g) | Number |
| Collected prior to 1951 |  |

## What questions might we ask?

| Table 1: Burtin's data. <br> Bacteria | Antibiotic |  |  | Gram Staining |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Penicillin | Streptomycin | Neomycin |  |
| Aerobacter aerogenes | 870 | 1 | 1.6 | negative |
| Brucella abortus | 1 | 2 | 0.02 | negative |
| Brucella anthracis | 0.001 | 0.01 | 0.007 | positive |
| Diplococcus pneumoniae | 0.005 | 11 | 10 | positive |
| Escherichia coli | 100 | 0.4 | 0.1 | negative |
| Klebsiella pneumoniae | 850 | 1.2 | 1 | negative |
| Mycobacterium tuberculosis | 800 | 5 | 2 | negative |
| Proteus vulgaris | 3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | negative |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa | 850 | 2 | 0.4 | negative |
| Salmonella (Eberthella) typhosa | 1 | 0.4 | 0.008 | negative |
| Salmonella schotrnuelleri | 10 | 0.8 | 0.09 | negative |
| Staphylococcus albus | 0.007 | 0.1 | 0.001 | positive |
| Staphylococcus aureus | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.001 | positive |
| Streptococcus fecalis | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | positive |
| Streptococcus hemolyticus | 0.001 | 14 | 10 | positive |
| Streptococcus viridans | 0.005 | 10 | 40 | positive |

## Will Burtin, 1951

|  | Bacteria | Penicillin | Antibiotic Streptomycin | Neomycin | Gram stain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Aerobacter aerogenes | 870 | 1 | 1.6 | - |
|  | Brucella abortus | 1 | 2 | 0.02 | - |
|  | Bacillus anthracis | 0.001 | 0.01 | 0.007 | + |
|  | Diplococcus pneumoniae | 0.005 | 11 | 10 | + |
|  | Escherichia coli | 100 | 0.4 | 0.1 | - |
|  | Klebsiella pneumoniae | 850 | 1.2 | 1 | - |
|  | Mycobacterium tuberculosis | 800 | 5 | 2 | - |
|  | Proteus vulgaris | 3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |
|  | Pseudomonas aeruginosa | 850 | 2 | 0.4 | - |
|  | Salmonella (Eberthella) typhosa | 1 | 0.4 | 0.008 | - |
|  | Salmonella schottmuelleri | 10 | 0.8 | 0.09 | - |
|  | Staphylococcus albus | 0.007 | 0.1 | 0.001 | + |
|  | Staphylococcus aureus | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.001 | + |
|  | Streptococcus fecalis | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | + |
|  | Streptococcus hemolyticus | 0.001 | 14 | 10 | + |
|  | Streptococcus viridans | 0.005 | 10 | 40 | + |

How do the drugs compare?

## Will Burtin, 1951



| Bacteria | Penicillin | Antibiotic <br> Streptomycin | Neomycin | Gram <br> stain |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Aerobacter aerogenes | 870 | 1 | 1.6 | - |
| Brucella abortus | 1 | 2 | 0.02 | - |
| Bacillus anthracis | 0.001 | 0.01 | 0.007 | + |
| Diplococcus pneumoniae | 0.005 | 11 | 10 | + |
| Escherichia coli | 100 | 0.4 | 0.1 | - |
| Klebsiella pneumoniae | 850 | 1.2 | 1 | - |
| Mycobacterium tuberculosis | 800 | 5 | 2 | - |
| Proteus vulgaris | 3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa | 850 | 2 | 0.4 | - |
| Salmonella (Eberthella) typhosa | 1 | 0.4 | 0.008 | - |
| Salmonella schottmuelleri | 10 | 0.8 | 0.09 | - |
| Staphylococcus albus | 0.007 | 0.1 | 0.001 | + |
| Staphylococcus aureus | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.001 | + |
| Streptococcus fecalis | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | + |
| Streptococcus hemolyticus | 0.001 | 14 | 10 | + |
| Streptococcus viridans | 0.005 | 10 | 40 | + |

Radius: 1/log(MIC)
Bar Color: Antibiotic
Background Color: Gram Staining
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How do the bacteria group w.r.t. resistance? Do different drugs correlate?

Wainer \& Lysen
American Scientist, 2009

## Lessons

## Exploratory Process

1 Construct graphics to address questions
2 Inspect "answer" and assess new questions
3 Repeat!
Transform the data appropriately (e.g., invert, log)
"Show data variation, not design variation" -Tufte

## Tableau / Polaris

## Tableau

Research at Stanford: "Polaris" by Stolte, Tang \& Hanrahan.


## Tableau
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## Polaris/Tableau Approach

Insight: simultaneously specify both database queries and visualization

Choose data, then visualization, not vice versa
Use smart defaults for visual encodings

Can also suggest more encodings upon request (ShowMe - Like APT)

## Dałaseł

- Federal Elections Commission Receipts
- Every Congressional Candidate from 1996 to 2002
- 4 Election Cycles
- 9216 Candidacies


## Data Set Schema

- Year (Qi)
- Candidate Code (N)
- Candidate Name (N)
- Incumbent / Challenger / Open-Seat (N)
- Party Code (N) [1=Dem,2=Rep,3=Other]
- Party Name (N)
- Total Receipts (Qr)
- State (N)
- District (N)
- This is a subset of the larger data set available from the FEC, but should be sufficient for the demo


## Hypotheses?

## What might we learn from this data?

## Hypotheses?

What might we learn from this data?

- Have receipts increased over time?
- Do democrats or republicans spend more?
- Candidates from which state spend the most money?


## Tableau Demo

## Specifying Table Configurations

Operands are names of database fields
Each operand interpreted as a set \{...\}
Data is either O or Q and treated differently
Three operafors:
concatenation (+) cross product ( x ) nest (/)
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## Table Algebra

The operators (,$+ x_{l} /$ ) and operands $(O, Q)$ provide an algebra for tabular visualization

Algebraic statements are mapped to Visualizations - trellis partitions, visual encodings Queries - selection, projection, group-by

In Tableau, users make statements via drag-and-drop Users specify operands NOT operators! Operators are inferred by data type $(O, Q)$

