**A Profile of the Respondents**
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The age range of the respondents in the 2016 datasets were like those in the 2014 survey. That survey showed that most of the participants had a prior job. The chart below (*Figure 2)* verifies this thought as far more participants were on, at least, their second job than on their first. Also, just like the 2014 dataset, most participants work in the United States and the order of highest proportions, from least to greatest is the same (*Figure 1)*.
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The next two charts show striking difference that can become relevant in regression. Figure three shows that most of the participants in the survey was men and figure four shows that very few people were self-employed. Those findings become important as recognizing the difference between self-employment and with a company might impact the conclusions later as well as setting up an essential portion of the study, which is the difference between genders.
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The next two charts describe the nature of the companies that the participants work for. Figure five shows that most of the companies represented by the participants were predominantly either technology or it focused. The figure below that, figure six, shows that most of the participants were using working on the back or front-end of projects.

Figure seven, the final visual to explain the aggregate data was looking towards the number of people who sought treatment. The data shows that more than half of the participants took treatment. This observation becomes more important when the regression equation is completed, further in the analysis.
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The age range summary data of the male participants show that most of them are in their 30’s. Figures eight and nine, when combined with the summary data, suggests that average male participant has had a job before, and it was more than likely technology focused.
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Figure 10 expands on the two figures above by establishing that the average participant would most likely be either a back-end or front-end developer.

However, the initial analysis shows that additional work must be done to determine significance as these general statistics on receiving treatment illustrate that slightly more than half of the participants received help of any kind (*Figure 11)*.
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**Female**

The age range summary data of the female participants was like those of the men participants. Both sets of data show that most of them are in their 30’s. Figures 12 and 13 suggest that the average female participant has had a job before that was primarily technology focused.
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Figure 14 shows that, like male participants, most of the female participants were either front or back end developers. However, Figure 15 shows that women participants were more willing to receive treatments than men survey participants.