Multidimensional Visualization

Maneesh Agrawala

CS 294-10: Visualization Spring 2011 Last Time: Exploratory Data An<u>alysis</u>

Topics

Exploratory Data Analysis Data Diagnostics Graphical Methods Data Transformation Confirmatory Data Analysis Statistical Hypothesis Testing

Exploratory Analysis: Effectiveness of Antibiotics

What questions might we ask?

| Table 1: Burtin's data. | | Antibiotic | | |
|--|------------|--------------|----------|---------------|
| Bacteria | Penicillin | Streptomycin | Neomycin | Gram Staining |
| 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) <i>typhosa</i> | 1 | 0.4 | 0.008 | negative |
| Salmonella schottmuelleri | 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 |



How do the drugs compare?





Common Data Transformations

| Normalize Log Power | y _i / Σ _i y _i (among others) log y | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Box-Cox Transform | y (y ^λ −1)/λ ifλ≠0 logy ifλ=0 | | | |
| Binning Grouping | e.g., histograms e.g., merge categories | | | |

Often performed to aid comparison (% or scale difference) or better approx. normal distribution

Lessons

Exploratory Process

- 1 Construct graphics to address questions
- 2 Inspect "answer" and assess new questions3 Repeat!

Transform the data appropriately (e.g., invert, log)

"Show data variation, not design variation"

-Tufte

Exploratory Analysis: Participation on Amazon's Mechanical Turk

The Data Set (~200 rows)

Turker ID Avg. Completion Rate String Number [0,1]

Collected in 2009 by Heer & Bostock.

What questions might we ask of the data? What charts might provide insight?

















Lessons

Even for "simple" data, a variety of graphics might provide insight. Again, tailor the choice of graphic to the questions being asked, but be open to surprises.

Graphics can be used to understand and help assess the quality of statistical models.

Premature commitment to a model and lack of verification can lead an analysis astray.



Some Uses of Formal Statistics

What is the probability that the pattern I'm seeing might have arisen by chance?

- With what parameters does the data best fit a given function? What is the goodness of fit?
- How well do one (or more) data variables predict another?
- ... and many others.

Example: Heights by Gender

| Gender Height (in) | | Male / Female Number |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| μ _m = 69.4 | $\sigma_{\rm m}$ = 4.69 | N _m = 1000 |
| μ _f = 63.8 | $\sigma_{\rm f}$ = 4.18 | N _f = 1000 |

Is this difference in heights significant?

In other words: assuming no true difference, what is the prob. that our data is due to chance?









Formulating a Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis (H₀): Alternate Hypothesis (H₂): $\mu_m = \mu_f$ (population) $\mu_m \neq \mu_f$ (population)

- A statistical hypothesis test assesses the likelihood of the null hypothesis.
- What is the probability of sampling the observed data assuming population means are equal?

This is called the *p* value.

Testing Procedure

Compute a test statistic. This is a number that in essence summarizes the difference.













Summary

Exploratory analysis may combine graphical methods, data transformations, and statistics.

Use questions to uncover more questions.

Formal methods may be used to confirm, sometimes on held-out or new data.

Announcements















Chernoff Faces (1973)

Insight: We have evolved a sophisticated ability to interpret facial expression

Idea: Map data variables to facial features



Question: Do we process facial features in an uncorrelated way? (i.e., are they *separable*?)

This is just one example of nD "glyphs"

Visualizing Multiple Dimensions

Strategies

- Avoid "over-encoding" Use space and small multiples intelligently Reduce the problem space Use interaction to generate *relevant* views
- There is rarely a single visualization that answers all questions. Instead, the ability to generate appropriate visualizations quickly is key

Tableau / Polaris

| Research a | it Stan | ford: "I | Polaris" k | by Stolte | and Han | rahan. |
|---|--|------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|--------|
| BDUINE v20 Stema () In Dyfrodact | pert 🛟 Back (| Ferward | | | Ckar | |
| Group in pares by | AVQ(Profit) A | Washington | Hanachaoetts | New York | California | |
| Product V Aggregate Data Seet in parent by: Noric Critic See | 500 500 500 500 100 100 -200 -200 -200 | | | | | |
| lefat tor | 839 709 500 500 500 500 500 500 500 500 500 5 | | ····· | $\langle \rangle$ | | |



Tableau demo

The dataset:

- Federal Elections Commission Receipts
- Every Congressional Candidate from 1996 to 2002
- 4 Election Cycles9216 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? Correlation between receipts and whether elected? Do receipts increase over time? Which states spend the most? Which party spends the most? Margin of victory vs. amount spent? Amount spent between competitors?

Hypotheses?

What might we learn from this data?

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

Polaris/Tableau Approach

Insight: simultaneously specify both database queries and visualization

Choose data, then visualization, not vice versa

Use smart defaults for visual encodings

Recently: automate visualization design (ShowMe – Like APT)

Specifying Table Configurations

Operands are names of database fields Each operand interpreted as a set {...} Quantitative and Ordinal fields treated differently

Three operators: concatenation (+) cross product (x) nest (/)

Table Algebra: Operands Ordinal fields: interpret domain as a set that partitions table into rows and columns Quarter = {(Qtr1),(Qtr2),(Qtr3),(Qtr4)} → Qtr1 Qtr2 Qtr3 Qtr4 05000 Quantitative fields: treat domain as single element set and encode spatially as axes Profit = {(Profit[-410,650])} → -200 -100 0 100

-300

200 300

Profit

Concatenation (+) Operator

Ordered union of set interpretations

Quarter + Product Type

Qtr2

= {(Qtr1),(Qtr2),(Qtr3),(Qtr4)} + {(Coffee), (Espresso)}

Coffee

151

Espresso

Qtr4

= {(Qtr1),(Qtr2),(Qtr3),(Qtr4),(Coffee),(Espresso)} Qtr3

Profit + Sales = {(Profit[-310,620]),(Sales[0,1000])}

200 400 600

Cross (x) Operator **Cross-product of set interpretations** Quarter x Product Type = {(Qtr1,Coffee), (Qtr1, Tea), (Qtr2, Coffee), (Qtr2, Tea), (Qtr3, Coffee), (Qtr3, Tea), (Qtr4, Coffee), (Qtr4, Tea)} Qtr1 Qtr2 Qtr3 Qtr4 Coffee Espresso Coffee Product Type x Profit =

Nest (/) Operator

Cross-product filtered by existing records

Quarter x Month

creates twelve entries for each quarter. i.e., (Qtr1, December)

Quarter / Month

creates three entries per quarter based on tuples in database (not semantics)

| Ordinal - Ordinal | | | | al |
|-------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| | Product Type | | | |
| State | Coffee | Espresso H | Herbal Tea | Теа |
| Colorado | • | • | • | • |
| Connecticut | • | • | • | • |
| Florida | • | | • | • |
| Illinois | • | • | • | • |
| Iowa | • | • | • | • |
| Louisiana | • | • | • | |
| Massachusetts | • | • | • | • |
| Missouri | • | • | • | • |
| Nevada | • | • | • | |
| New Hampshire | • | • | · · | • |
| New Mexico | • | • | • | |
| New York | • | • | • | • |
| Ohio | • | • | • | • |
| Oklahoma | • | • | • | |
| Oregon | • | • | • | • |
| Texas | • | • | • | |
| Utah | • | • | • | • |
| Washington | ٠ | • | • | • |
| Wisconsin | • | • | • | • |





