[1]:	5. Are all the columns numeric such as float or int? If not, please convert them to numeric (int/float) before going to the next step. 6. Plot the heatmap with correlations to get some more idea about the data. import pandas as pd import numpy as np import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import seaborn as sns import missingno as msno from scipy import stats
[2]:	
[3]: [3]:	city_development_index experience company_size last_new_job training_hours target 0 0.776 15 2 5 47 0.0
	2 0.920 5 2 1 24 0.0 3 0.762 13 0 5 18 1.0 4 0.920 7 2 1 46 1.0 12972 0.920 9 2 1 36 1.0
	12973 0.920 10 3 3 23 0.0 12974 0.920 7 1 1 25 0.0 12975 0.920 21 2 4 44 0.0 12976 0.802 0 4 2 97 0.0 12977 rows × 6 columns
[4]:	<pre>df.isna().sum().sort_values(ascending = False) city_development_index</pre>
[5]: rt[5]:	df.dtypes city_development_index float64 experience int64 company_size int64 last_new_job int64 training_hours int64
[6]: t[6]:	<pre>target</pre>
	Correlation Matrix 1 0.33 0.083 0.17 -0.00091 -0.43 -0.8 -0.8
	- 0.083 0.11 1 0.1 -0.016 -0.0094 -0.4
	- 0.17
	dity_development_index - company_size - company_siz
2	2. Feature Selection and Pre-processing 1. Put all the data from the dataframe into X, except the enrolle_id and the target columns
[7]:	<pre>2. Perform feature scaling on the data of X with StandardScaler and show some sample data from X after scaling (Use the technique shown in the second answer from this post: Link)</pre> <pre>X = df.iloc[:,:-1] y = df.iloc[:,-1]</pre> <pre>from sklearn.preprocessing import StandardScaler</pre>
	<pre>scaler = StandardScaler() scaler.fit(X) X_s = scaler.transform(X) print(X_s) [[-0.50342203 0.63395707 -0.5747232</pre>
3	[0.69643399 -0.58211224 -1.0314958 -0.74773864 -0.67134448] [0.69643399 1.54600905 -0.5747232 1.08113696 -0.35788885] [-0.28678136 -1.64617288 0.338822 -0.13811344 0.51648738]] 3. KMeans Clustering 1. Import related library for Kmeans and perform Kmeans on X (note that it was scaled already). Make sure to put random_state = 47 (it
	can be any number, but use 47 so that you will produce almost the same result as us). Use k-means++ for the initial centroids. You should know from the problem description how many clusters we are interested in. 2. Show the cluster centers as it is and then inverse the scale and show the centers. Please explain in words about the centers relating them to the columns of the data set 3. Show the distance matrix 4. Show the labels 5. Add a new column to your data frame called cluster_label and assign the cluster label for the instances based on the K-means cluster
	 6. The target column of our data frame is floating-point numbers. So, this number is not comparable with the cluster label. Add a column target_int and write a function or use a strategy to store the int version of the target column into the target_int column (For example, 1.0 in the target will be 1 in the target_int, 0.0 will be 0) 7. Show the top 5 rows of the dataframe now that shows you have added those two columns and they have the correct values 8. Now, we would like to compare the cluster label with the ground truth. Print confusion matrix that compares the target_int and the cluster_label, show the classification_report, and then show the total number of misclassification. 9. Discuss the numbers from 3 Viii and any thoughts on it.
	 10. Show the inertia of the cluster 11. What is the elbow method and what is its purpose of it in the case of KMeans clustering? 12. Although we just wanted 2 clusters, we still would like to see what will happen if you increase the number of clusters. Plot the inertia for the different numbers of clusters from 2 to 20. 13. Show a scatter plot with training hours against experience where the points should be colored based on the two cluster labels. Write any thoughts on this plot. 14. Show a scatter plot with any other two attributes you are interested in like 3 Xiii and add your thoughts on your plot as well.
[9]: [9]: 10]:	<pre>from sklearn.cluster import KMeans kmeans = KMeans(n_clusters = 2, init = "k-means++", random_state=47) kmeans.fit(X_s) KMeans(n_clusters=2, random_state=47)</pre> kmeans.transform(X_s)
10]: 11]:	array([[2.6387601 , 1.58409296],
u *	<pre>centers = kmeans.cluster_centers_ plt.scatter(centers[:, 0], centers[:, 1], c='black', s=200, alpha=0.5); 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2</pre>
12]:	0.00.20.40.60.3 -0.2 -0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4
12]: 13]:	<pre>kmeans.fit(X) KMeans(n_clusters=2, random_state=47) kmeans.transform(X) array([[7.20067157, 120.45227649], [35.53186796, 159.68082008], [18.98273357, 143.46835926],</pre>
14]:	<pre>inv_centers = kmeans.cluster_centers_ plt.scatter(inv_centers[:, 0], inv_centers[:, 1], c='black', s=200, alpha=0.5);</pre> inv_centers = kmeans.cluster_centers_ plt.scatter(inv_centers[:, 0], inv_centers[:, 1], c='black', s=200, alpha=0.5);
	10.830 - 10.825 - 10.820 -
C li	Centers are very different in this as they can be heavilly skewed by columns with large values ike training values as they will hold more weight to the model if not normalized.
15]: 16]: 17]:	<pre>identified_clusters = kmeans.fit_predict(X_s) identified_clusters array([1, 1, 0,, 0, 1, 0]) df["Cluster Label"] = identified_clusters df['target'] = df['target'].astype("int64")</pre>
18]: 18]:	df.head() city_development_index experience company_size last_new_job training_hours target Cluster Label 0 0.776 15 2 5 47 0 1 1 0.767 21 2 4 8 0 1
19]:	2 0.920 5 2 1 24 0 0 3 0.762 13 0 5 18 1 1 4 0.920 7 2 1 46 1 0 from sklearn.metrics import classification_report, confusion_matrix print(confusion_matrix(df["target"].values, df["Cluster_Label"].values))
	<pre>print(classification_report(df["target"].values, df["Cluster Label"].values)) [[5835 4860]</pre>
[20]: [20]: M	<pre>macro avg 0.43 0.39 0.39 12977 weighted avg 0.65 0.49 0.55 12977 confusion_matrix(df["target"].values, df["Cluster Label"].values)[0][1] + confusion_matrix(df["target"].values) 6607 Model is very innacurate, lots of false positives and false negatives. Model classifies too many positives.</pre>
[21]: [21]: El	kmeans.inertia_ 49643.86379769524 Ibow method is to find the optimal k value of the model. It plots the inertia of each model at a cetrain k. wcss=[]
	<pre>for i in range(2,20): kmeans = KMeans(i, init = "k-means++", random_state=47) kmeans.fit(X_s) wcss_iter = kmeans.inertia_ wcss.append(wcss_iter) number_clusters = range(2,20) plt.plot(number_clusters, wcss) plt.title('The Elbow title') plt.xlabel('Number of clusters') plt.ylabel('WCSS')</pre>
22]:	Text (0, 0.5, 'WCSS') The Elbow title 50000 - 45000 - 400000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 400000 - 40000 - 40000 - 400000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 40000 - 400
	35000 - 25000 - 25000 - 25000 - 25000 - 255
23]:	<pre>plt.figure(figsize = (10,10)) sns.scatterplot(data = df, x = "training_hours", y = "experience", alpha = 0.7, c = df["Cluster Label"].val plt.show()</pre>
M	Todel seems to be biased towards higher experience and there seems to be no effect caused by training hours. plt.figure(figsize = (10,10)) sns.scatterplot(data = df, x = "city_development_index", y = "experience", alpha = 0.7, c = df["Cluster Lab plt.show()
	20 -
	5 -
Ņ	Model seems to be biased towards both higher City Development Index and Higher
4	A. Agglomerative Clustering (Helping recourse for the relevant codes: Help Link
[25]:	 Plot a dendrogram (make the figure size relatively big, but still you will not be able to see it completely. However, it least this will give you an idea on how many cluster would you like to generate) Perform AgglomerativeClustering with 2 clusters first, and use euclidean distance for affinity and linkage = 'ward' After creating the clusters, plot training hours against experience like 3.Xiii and discuss if anything interesting Then, increase the number of clusters to 4 or 5 and build the clusters again and plot them again to see any difference. import scipy.cluster.hierarchy as shc plt.figure(figsize=(10, 7))
	plt.title("Dendrograms") dend = shc.dendrogram(shc.linkage(X_s, method='ward')) Dendrograms 160 140
	120 - 100 - 80 -
	60 - 40 - 40 - 40 - 40 - 40 - 40 - 40 -
[26]: [27]:	<pre>from sklearn.cluster import AgglomerativeClustering cluster = AgglomerativeClustering(n_clusters=2, affinity='euclidean', linkage='ward') cluster = cluster.fit_predict(X_s) plt.figure(figsize = (10,10)) sns.scatterplot(data = df, x = "training_hours", y = "experience", alpha = 0.7, c = cluster)</pre>
	20 - (100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10
	10
	0 50 100 150 200 250 300 350 training_hours
	There seems to be no huge correlation within the agglomerative clustering and the prediction out seems to have some bias towards higher experience combined with less training hours. cluster = AgglomerativeClustering(n clusters=4, affinity='euclidean', linkage='ward')
[28]:	<pre>cluster = cluster.fit_predict(X_s)</pre>
[28]:	<pre>cluster = cluster.fit_predict(X_s) plt.figure(figsize = (10,10)) sns.scatterplot(data = df, x = "training_hours", y = "experience", alpha = 0.7, c = cluster) plt.show()</pre>
[28]:	plt.figure(figsize = (10,10)) sns.scatterplot(data = df, x = "training_hours", y = "experience", alpha = 0.7, c = cluster) plt.show() 20 15
[28]:	plt.figure(figsize = (10,10)) sns.scatterplot(data = df, x = "training_hours", y = "experience", alpha = 0.7, c = cluster) plt.show() 20 15