

I read over the assigned reading and worked through the code in Tasks 1,2, and 4.

Task 2:

- 1.
2. Their prospects are not very good. There only seems to be one example of a win in that situation.
- 3.
4. No, the generally lose.
- 5.
6. Yes, it is much more common than not.
- 7.
8. I would suggest that they get at least half of their contributions from out of state. I would show them t2_won, since the question does not specify whether they are an incumbent or not.

Task 3:

These charts show the relationship between the total amount of money given to a campaign and the percentage of that money that came from in-state. One thing that is common amongst both winners and losers is that they are more likely to receive more money from out-of-state contributions than in-state contributions. Also, because in the graph on the left the bars sit quite a bit higher than the graph on the right, we can make the conclusion that winners generally raise more money than losers. Furthermore, if you gain all of your money from in-state sources, you are guaranteed to lose. These graphs show the positive impact out-of-state contributions have on the outcome of an election.

One of the things that is immediately apparent is that there were no winners who received over 80% of their funding from in-state. This is harder to see in the graphs from task 2 because of the number of plotted points. Also apparent is the fact that winners who had more than 50% of their contributions from in-state earned much more money overall than losers receiving the percentage of in-state contributions.