The problem: The problem set book for the 2013 Data Expo was to provide a graphical example of important features of given data set. The data provided were three years of survey data for "The Soul of the Community" collected by the Knight Foundation. The Knight Foundation surveyed members of 20 communities over the three years, asking a variety of questions about community involvement.

Which communities were over-surveyed? In most communities, approximately 25 people were surveyed; however, certain communities were more surveyed, such as Houston, 30; and Palm Beach, 400. It appears that the Knight Foundation was trying to cover places of a comparatively smaller rate, which is why Philadelphia (like many) was surveyed 1132 times in 2010. To see which places were used an under-represented in the survey, I created maps showing the percentage of the community that was polled for each polling year.
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What behaviors do survey-takers generally engage in? In 2010, the most common behavior was being registered to vote, and the least common was providing free shelter to an individual. For racial and ethnic minorities, the plots initially looked incredibly strange, which turned out to be because of the small sample sizes in those communities. For non-parents answering the surveys, the faceted plot showing the responses over time did not show any clear trend.

Do residents have meta-knowledge about their community? That is, do the personal population opinions on the community as a place for seniors continue to serve as a foundation for the community as a place to live? Do minorities know how the community is for people with children? Do non-parents know how the community is for people with children?

Is the community a good place for seniors? It appears that non-minorities understand how great it is to live in a community that is a good place for seniors than older people under 65. This was true across every community surveyed.

Is the community a good place for kids? Ideally, I would have liked to compare the differences in ratings to reported levels of community satisfaction, but it was hard to know how to compare the component variables in the comparison. Instead, I plotted the differences in positive responses containing reported rates of growth in 2010. There is no clear trend; although, one might be able to use a chart of positive relationship between rates of growth for children (10-14) and cities that saw growth in 2010. Certainly, Milledgeville, GA (where people without kids thought it was better for children than those with kids) didn’t see a clear trend.
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