W203 Lab 1: Candidate Dept EDA

Jon Mease
James De La Torre
Adam Yang

Introduction

As members of the campaign committee for the upcoming Washinton state election, we are interested in the nature of debt that candidates for office have taken on in past elections. This report contains the findings of our initial exploratory data analysis of a dataset from the 2012 election.

Research question: How can the amount of debt taken on by candidates in the 2012 Washington state election be understood in relation to all of the other available fields in this data set?

Load data set

The data set we are investigating is named `CandidateDebt.csv` and it is located in the `datasets` directory distributed alongside this report.

First, we use R to load the data set in the `DebtRaw` variable, treating the string `'#N/A'` as a missing value.

```
DebtRaw = read.csv("../dataset/CandidateDebt.csv", na.strings='#N/A')
```

This initial dataset has 28 columns and 1043 rows

```
print(sprintf("Number of columns: %d, Number of rows: %d", ncol(DebtRaw), nrow(DebtRaw)))
```

```
## [1] "Number of columns: 28, Number of rows: 1043"
```

Align column labels

Next, we examine the first 4 rows of the dataset across all columns

```
str(DebtRaw[1:4,])
```

```
## 'data.frame':    4 obs. of  28 variables:
##  $ reportnumber       : int  100495995 100496548 100498383 100495987
##  $ origin             : Factor w/ 1 level "B.3": 1 1 1 1
##  $ filerid            : Factor w/ 141 levels "ASHAK  359","BILLA2 203",..: 110 129 30 122
##  $ filertype          : Factor w/ 1 level "Candidate": 1 1 1 1
##  $ filername          : Factor w/ 134 levels "ASHABRANER KARIN L",..: 105 124 31 117
##  $ firstname          : Factor w/ 106 levels "ACHIYAMMA","ALLEN",..: 19 103 43 99
##  $ middleinitial      : Factor w/ 23 levels "","A","B","C",..: 19 15 4 5
##  $ lastname           : Factor w/ 129 levels "ASHABRANER","AXTHELM",..: 101 119 30 113
##  $ office             : Factor w/ 16 levels "APPEALS COURT JUDGE",..: 12 4 12 6
##  $ legislativedistrict: Factor w/ 14 levels "ATTORNEY GENERAL",..: 11 11 11 11
##  $ position           : int  1 1 1 1
##  $ party              : int  NA NA NA NA
##  $ jurisdiction       : Factor w/ 4 levels "DEMOCRAT","INDEPENDENT",..: 4 4 4 4
##  $ jurisdictioncounty : Factor w/ 51 levels "ATTORNEY GENERAL, OFFICE OF",..: 10 10 10 10
##  $ jurisdictiontype   : Factor w/ 15 levels "","BENTON","CLALLAM",..: 6 6 6 6
##  $ electionyear       : Factor w/ 4 levels "Judicial","Legislative",..: 2 2 2 2
##  $ amount             : int  2012 2012 2012 2012
##  $ recordtype         : num  283 283 283 283
##  $ fromdate           : Factor w/ 1 level "DEBT": 1 1 1 1
##  $ thrudate           : Factor w/ 37 levels "1/1/10","1/1/11",..: 30 30 30 30
##  $ debtdate           : Factor w/ 30 levels "1/31/10","1/31/11",..: 24 24 24 24
##  $ code               : Factor w/ 72 levels "1/21/11","1/22/10",..: 61 61 61 61
##  $ description        : Factor w/ 4 levels "","Fundraising",..: 1 1 1 1
##  $ vendorname         : Factor w/ 106 levels "","$750 PER MONTH THROUGH OCTOBER",..: 73 73 73 73
##  $ vendoraddress      : Factor w/ 75 levels "ABBOT TAYLOR",..: 26 26 26 26
##  $ vendorcity         : Factor w/ 80 levels "","10 SABLE COURT ",..: 68 68 68 68
##  $ vendorstate        : Factor w/ 30 levels "","BAINBRIDGE ISLAND",..: 30 30 30 30
##  $ vendorzip          : Factor w/ 5 levels "","CA","DC","TX",..: 5 5 5 5
```

Based on the column names, factor levels, and values it appears that the columns of this data set are well aligned over the first 9 columns (`reportnumber` through `office`). There seems to be an alignment error, However, beginning with the `legislativedistrict` column. The first factor level of this column, `"ATTORNEY GENERAL"`, is not sensible as a legislative district. Instead we expect legislative districts to be identified by an integer, as is the case for the column immediatly after `legislativedistrict`

After careful examination, it is clear that the column labels from `legislativedistrict` all the way through `vendorstate` should all be shifted forward by one position. In this shift we remove the trailing `vendorzip` label, which is appropriate since we do not have any data columns consistent with zip codes. We must also introduce a new label for the data column previously labeled by `jurisdiction`. We will choose the name `DUMMY` for the time being, and will introduce a more meaningful name once we have identified the column's contents.

```r
DebtShifted = DebtRaw
colnames(DebtShifted) <- c(colnames(DebtRaw)[1:9],
                           'DUMMY',
                           colnames(DebtRaw)[10:(ncol(DebtRaw)-1)])
```

We once examine the first 4 rows of the data set, and note that the column labels are now well aligned with the data columns. We discuss the columns in more detail in the following section.

```r
str(DebtShifted[1:4,])
```

```
## 'data.frame':    4 obs. of  28 variables:
##  $ reportnumber       : int  100495995 100496548 100498383 100495987
##  $ origin             : Factor w/ 1 level "B.3": 1 1 1 1
##  $ filerid            : Factor w/ 141 levels "ASHAK  359","BILLA2 203",..: 110 129 30 122
##  $ filertype          : Factor w/ 1 level "Candidate": 1 1 1 1
##  $ filername          : Factor w/ 134 levels "ASHABRANER KARIN L",..: 105 124 31 117
##  $ firstname          : Factor w/ 106 levels "ACHIYAMMA","ALLEN",..: 19 103 43 99
##  $ middleinitial      : Factor w/ 23 levels "","A","B","C",..: 19 15 4 5
##  $ lastname           : Factor w/ 129 levels "ASHABRANER","AXTHELM",..: 101 119 30 113
##  $ office             : Factor w/ 16 levels "APPEALS COURT JUDGE",..: 12 4 12 6
##  $ DUMMY              : Factor w/ 14 levels "ATTORNEY GENERAL",..: 11 11 11 11
##  $ legislativedistrict: int  1 1 1 1
##  $ position           : int  NA NA NA NA
##  $ party              : Factor w/ 4 levels "DEMOCRAT","INDEPENDENT",..: 4 4 4 4
##  $ jurisdiction       : Factor w/ 51 levels "ATTORNEY GENERAL, OFFICE OF",..: 10 10 10 10
##  $ jurisdictioncounty : Factor w/ 15 levels "","BENTON","CLALLAM",..: 6 6 6 6
##  $ jurisdictiontype   : Factor w/ 4 levels "Judicial","Legislative",..: 2 2 2 2
##  $ electionyear       : int  2012 2012 2012 2012
##  $ amount             : num  283 283 283 283
##  $ recordtype         : Factor w/ 1 level "DEBT": 1 1 1 1
##  $ fromdate           : Factor w/ 37 levels "1/1/10","1/1/11",..: 30 30 30 30
##  $ thrudate           : Factor w/ 30 levels "1/31/10","1/31/11",..: 24 24 24 24
##  $ debtdate          : Factor w/ 72 levels "1/21/11","1/22/10",..: 61 61 61 61
##  $ code              : Factor w/ 4 levels "","Fundraising",..: 1 1 1 1
##  $ description       : Factor w/ 106 levels "","$750 PER MONTH THROUGH OCTOBER",..: 73 73 73 73
##  $ vendorname        : Factor w/ 75 levels "ABBOT TAYLOR",..: 26 26 26 26
##  $ vendoraddress     : Factor w/ 80 levels "","10 SABLE COURT ",..: 68 68 68 68
##  $ vendorcity        : Factor w/ 30 levels "","BAINBRIDGE ISLAND",..: 30 30 30 30
##  $ vendorstate       : Factor w/ 5 levels "","CA","DC","TX",..: 5 5 5 5
```

Convert dates

The variables `fromdate`, `thrudate`, and `debtdate` are factors that represent dates using a mm/dd/yy format. Here we convert these into `Date` instances.

```
#DebtShifted$fromdate <- as.Date(DebtShifted$fromdate, format='%m/%d/%y')
#DebtShifted$thrudate <- as.Date(DebtShifted$thrudate, format='%m/%d/%y')
#DebtShifted$debtdate <- as.Date(DebtShifted$debtdate, format='%m/%d/%y')
```

Describe variables

Next, an brief overview of these 28 variables. The initial description in *italics* is the description provided in the `CandidateDebt.pdf` documentation provided alongside the dataset.

- `reportnumber`: *identifier used for tracking the individual form*
  This contains integers with values like 100495995, 100496548, etc. It contains no duplicate or missing values.
- `origin`: *This field shows from which filed report-type the data originates.*
  Factor with a single level, `B.3`, that contains no missing values.
- `filerid`: *The unique id assigned to a candidate*
  Unique candidate id string that is somewhat based on the candidates name. Of the 1043 rows, there are only 141 unique `filerid` values. There are no missing values.
- `filertype`: *Indicates if this record is for a candidate*
  Factor with a single level, `Candidate`, that contains no missing values.
- `filername`: *The candidate or committee name as reported on the candidates registration.*
  Of the 1043 rows, there are only 134 unique `filername` values. There are no missing values.
- `firstname`: *This field represents the first name, as reported by the filer*
  There are no missing values.
- `middleinitial`: *This field represents the middle initial, as reported by the filer*
  There are no missing values.
- `lastname`: *This field represents the last name, as reported by the filer*
  There are no missing values.
- `office`: *The office sought by the candidate*
  There are 16 unique `office` values present in the dataset (`GOVERNOR`, `STATE SENATOR`, `COUNTY SHERIFF`, etc.). There are no missing values.
- `DUMMY`:
  This is the placeholder column label that was introduced above in order to align the subsequent column labels with their data columns. There are 14 unique `DUMMY` values present in the dataset, and these 14 values are a proper subset of the 16 unique values present in the `office` variable described above.

- `legislativedistrict`: *The Washington State legislative district*
  This contains integer district identifiers ranging from 1 to 48 with 354 missing values.
- `position`: *The position associated with an office*
  This contains integers ranging from 1 to 40 with 574 missing values.
- `party`: *The political party as declared by the candidate on their registration*
  This is a factor containing 4 levels: `DEMOCRAT`, `REPUBLICAN`, `INDEPENDENT`, `NON PARTISAN`. There are 56 missing values.
- `jurisdiction`: *The political jurisdiction associated with the office of a candidate*
  There are 51 unique `jurisdiction` values with values like `LEG DISTRICT 11 - SENATE`, `LEG DISTRICT 41 - HOUSE`, `SUPREME COURT`, etc. There are 56 missing values.
- `jurisdictioncounty`: *The county associated with the jurisdiction of a candidate*
  There are 15 unique `jurisdictioncounty` values including `KING`, `PIERCE`, `SPOKANE`, etc. There are 56 missing values and an additional 215 empty values.
- `jurisdictiontype`: *The type of jurisdiction this office is: Statewide, Local, etc*
  There are 4 `jurisdictiontype` values: `Statewide`, `Legislative`, `Local`, and `Judicial`. There are 56 missing values
- `electionyear`: *The election year in the case of candidates*
  The election year is the repeated integer 2012, with 56 missing values.
- `amount`: *The amount of the debt incurred or order placed*
  Floating point values representing the debt incurred in dollars. Values range from 3.24 to 19000.00 and there are 56 missing values.
- `recordtype`: *This field designates the item as a debt*
  Factor with a single level, `DEBT`, that also contains 56 missing values.
- `fromdate`: *The start date of the period for the report on which this debt record was reported*
  Dates that range from 2009-10-01 to 2012-08-01 with 56 missing values.
- `thrudate`: *The end date of the period for the report on which this debt record was reported*
  Dates that range from 2009-10-31 to 2012-08-31 with 56 missing values.
- `debtdate`: *The date that the debt was incurred*
  Dates that range from 2008-10-29 to 2012-08-31 with 56 missing values.
- `code`: *The type of debt*
  There are 3 unique purchase codes: `Operation and Overhead`, `Management Services`, and `Fundraising`. In addition, there are 56 missing values and 610 empty values.
- `description`: *The reported description of the transaction*
  There are 106 unique purhcase descriptions. There are 56 missing values and an additional 39 empty values.
- `vendorname`: *The name of the vendor or recipient's name*
  There are 75 unique values (e.g. `SEATTLE MEDIUM NEWSPAPER`, `IMPACT SIGNS`, `THE CONNECTIONS GROUP`, etc.), and 56 missing values.
- `vendoraddress`: *The street address of the vendor or recipient*
  There are 80 unique values (e.g. `PO BOX 650448`, `5810 COWAN PL NE`, `2600 S JACKSON ST`, etc.). There are 56 missing values and an additional 24 empty values.
- `vendorcity`: *The city of the vendor or recipient*
  There are 30 unique values (e.g. `SAN JOSE`, `SEATTLE`, `TUMWATER`, etc.). There are 56 missing values and an additional 24 empty values.

- `vendorstate`: *The state of the vendor or recipient*
  There are 4 unique values: `WA`, `DC`, `TX`, `CA`. There are 56 missing values and an additional 25 empty values.

Examine row alignment

Then examine some of the rows (example of one that lines up and one that does not)

Then example of one that appears to be out of order (Jill Johnson)

Then discussion of the repititions in the right. But amount always repeats with all of the other columns.

It seems that left and right are two tables that are not (generally) aligned. Given rows that align and Jill Johnson

Speculate that some form of malformed SQL join introduced the duplicates.

We will look at the right table only, with duplicates removed. Note that this assumes that we don't have valid identical transactions on identical days.

Split data set and remove duplicates

```r
# Split off left table
DebtLeft = DebtShifted[, seq(9)]

# Split off right table
DebtRight = DebtShifted[, seq(10, ncol(DebtRaw))]

# Rename DUMMY to office
colnames(DebtRight)[[1]] <- "office"

# Keep cases with at least one non-NA entry
DebtRightValid <- DebtRight[rowSums(!is.na(DebtRight)) > 0,]

# Drop duplicates
Debt <- unique(DebtRightValid)
```

After cleaning steps above, we're left with 194 observations over 19 variables

Univariate Analysis of Key Variables

Univariate analysis…

Who are the candidates and how many reports did they file?

```r
# Find number of unique reportnumbers
length(unique(DebtLeft$reportnumber))
```

```
## [1] 1043
```

```r
# Find number of unique cadidate names
length(unique(DebtLeft$filername))
```

```
## [1] 134
```

On the left half of the data set, we were given 1043 unique report numbers, each of which are associated with a candidate. However, there are only 134 unique candidate names in the data set. This suggests that some candidate filed multiple B.3 reports.

To visualize this, we can aggregate the data into a dataframe showing the number of reports filed by each candidate. The summary of this dataframe shows that the candidate that filed the most reports, filed 38 of them while the candidate that filed the fewest reports filed only one. The median of the dataset is 6, while the mean is 7.784 which suggests a strong skew towards the right of the histogram.

```
# Find the number of reports filed by each candidate
RepPerCan <- aggregate(reportnumber ~ filername, DebtLeft, length)
colnames(RepPerCan)[2] <- "NumOfReports"
# Summarize data
summary(RepPerCan$NumOfReports)
```

```
##    Min. 1st Qu.  Median    Mean 3rd Qu.    Max.
##   1.000   2.000   6.000   7.784  10.000  38.000
```

The summary of this dataframe shows that the candidate that filed the most reports, filed 38 of them while the candidate that filed the fewest reports filed only one. The median of the dataset is 6, while the mean is 7.784 which suggests a strong skew towards the right of the histogram.

Before looking at the histogram, lets take a look at the candidates that filed the most reports. Unfortunately, our dataset does not allow us to view which candidates occured the most debt. However, we can see which ones filed the most debt reports.

```
# Show top 5 candidates that filed the most reports
head(RepPerCan[order(RepPerCan$NumOfReports, decreasing = TRUE),],5)
```

```
##                filername NumOfReports
## 39     GOLDMARK PETER J           38
## 6           BROWN LISA J           34
## 94 PRENTICE MARGARITA L           30
## 76     MCINTIRE JAMES L           28
## 11         CHOPP FRANK V           23
```

The summary of the dataset suggests that there are many candidates that filed only one report. In fact, 22 candidates filed only 1 report.

```
# How many candidates filed only 1 report?
length(which(RepPerCan$NumOfReports == 1))
```

```
## [1] 22
```

The figure below is a histogram showing the number of reports filed by each candidate and it does seem that there is a skew to the right. Most candidates filed between 1 and 5 reports and very few filed over 20 reports.

```
# Show histogram showing distribution of the number of reports filed by each candidate.
hist(RepPerCan$NumOfReports, main = "Histogram of the Number of Reports Filed by Each Candidate",
     xlab = "Number of Reports Filed by a Candidate")
axis(1, at = seq(0,40, by = 5))
```



Which offices are being pursued by the candidates?

To get a sense of how many candidates are applying for each office, we first have to get rid of the duplicate candidates.

```
# Remove reportnumber and keep unique rows
Office <- unique(DebtLeft[-1])
# Find length of rows.
length(Office$filerid)
```

```
## [1] 141
```

After creating this new dataframe, there are 141 rows instead of the expected 134. By doing a summary of Office$filername, we can see that there are 7 candidates that have more than 1 row. Upon inspection, these 7 candidates have 2 different filerids and sought 2 different offices. An example is shown below. According to the two rows shown below, it looks like David S Frockt was running for State Representative but then switched to State Senator based on the numbering of the filerid. With some quick research, we found that David Frockt was a State Representative in 2010 but was elected as State Senator in the middle of 2011 after the death of Senator Scott White. This special situation would explains the discrepancy with the dataset.

```
# Show exmaple of duplicate candidate.
Office[Office$filername == "FROCKT DAVID S",]
```

```
##     origin    filerid filertype      filername firstname middleinitial
## 81     B.3 FROCD2 111 Candidate FROCKT DAVID S     DAVID             S
## 355    B.3 FROCD  111 Candidate FROCKT DAVID S     DAVID             S
##     lastname               office
## 81    FROCKT        STATE SENATOR
## 355   FROCKT STATE REPRESENTATIVE
```

Because when a candidate changes his mind and decides to go for a different office, it still reflects the popularity of both offices. Besides, we do not have to data to determine which of these offices the candidate ended up running for so I will keep these the dataset as 141 rows and not remove any duplicate candidate for the histogram.

```
# Create Dataframe showing the number of candidates running for each office
OfficePopularity <- aggregate(filername ~ office, Office, length)
colnames(OfficePopularity)[2] <- "N"

# Show barplot of results
op <- par(mar = c(10,4,4,2) + 0.1)
barplot(OfficePopularity$N, main = "Number of Candidates Running for Each Office", ylab = "# of Cadidat
      names.arg=OfficePopularity$office, las = 2, cex.names=0.6)
```



```
par(op)
```

Which party has the most candidates running for office?

Now we will start looking at the data in the second data set (the one with vendor information and debt amount). We have no way of knowing which debt report was filed by which candidate and we know from above that one candidate can file multiple reports. However, assuming that each candidate will have a unique combination of office, legislative dictrict, position, party, and jurisdiction, we can find the rows that are unique for all of these categories and assume each row is a candidate. Now we can plot a bar chart to get a sense of how many cadidates for each party are filing these debt reports.

```
# Only keep Office2, legislativedictrict, position, party, jurisdiction and find unique rows
DebtUnique <- unique(Debt[1:5])
#
PartyCount <- aggregate(jurisdiction ~ party, DebtUnique, length)
colnames(PartyCount)[2] <- "N"
#
```

```
op <- par(mar = c(5,4,4,2) + 0.1)
barplot(PartyCount$N, main = "Number of Candidates from each Party", ylab = "# of Cadidates",
      names.arg=PartyCount$party, las = 2, cex.names=0.6)
```



```
par(op)
```

As mentioned before, the two data sets are really different and both are very innacurate. So the only thing we can get out of this bar chart is that there are mostly Democratic Candidates running for offices in Washington State.

Histogram of the debt amount

```
summary(Debt$amount)
```

```
##     Min.  1st Qu.   Median     Mean  3rd Qu.     Max.
##     3.24   271.88   400.00  1387.59  1328.41 19000.00
```

Very strong skew to the right.

```
hist(Debt$amount, breaks = seq(0, 20000, by = 100) , main = "Histogram of the Amount of Dollars per Deb
     xlab = "Debt Amount per Report ($)", las = 2)
axis(1, at = seq(0, 20000, by = 1000), las = 2)
```



```
filteredAmount <- Debt[(Debt$amount < 4000),]
hist(filteredAmount$amount, breaks = seq(0, 4000, by = 100) , main = "Histogram of the Amount of Dollar
     xlab = "Debt Amount per Report ($)", las = 2)
axis(1, at = seq(0, 4000, by = 1000), las = 2)
```



##

Analysis of Key Relationships

Key relationships…

How much money is each party spending?

The first bivariate relationship explored was the total expenditure by political party. The working debt dataset was grouped by party, and the sum of the dollar amounts for each group was computed. Figure 10 shows a bar chart with this information. Expenditures in the dataset were overwhelmingly from Democrats, accounting for 79% of the total dolalr amount.

```r
# sum amount by party
amountbyparty <-aggregate(Debt['amount'], by=list(party=Debt$party), FUN=sum)

#format method, which is necessary for formating in a data.frame
format.money  <- function(x, ...) {
  paste0("$", formatC(as.numeric(x), format="f", digits=2, big.mark=","))
}
class(amountbyparty$amount) <- c("money",class(amountbyparty$amount))


# sort the list descending, create pareto
amountbyparty <- amountbyparty[order(amountbyparty$amount, decreasing=TRUE),]

# bar plot tutorial https://www.statmethods.net/graphs/bar.html
barplot(amountbyparty$amount, main="Total Expenditures by Political Party",
    xlab="Political Party",
    names.arg=amountbyparty$party,
    cex.names=1)
```



Where is the money going?

The next relationship explored was expenditure by expense category. The dataset's description column provided some categorization of expenses, but since the description field was populated by different people for different reports, there was not much consistency of description values. Out of 194 records, there were 105 unique values in the description column. Another column in the dataset, code, was supposed to provide a more generalized categorization of expenses. However, this field was populated in only 94 of 194 records and only encompassed 20% of the grand total of all expenses in the dataset ($55,326.09 out of $269,191.70).

Since the description data were too granular, and since the code data were too sparse, a new column, coarsedescription, was generated by manually examining the values in the original description column and assigning more general, coarse labels to them. For example, there were 23 description values of the form "TREASURY" + month. These were all assigned into coarsecategory "TREASURY". Similarly, there were several descriptions values that indicated they were related to consulting, so these were assigned coarsedescription "CONSULTING". In some cases where the nature of an expense was not immediately clear, a quick bit of web searching for the type of business in the vendorname column helped to determine a reasonable value for coarsedescription. In those cases, an explanation of the reasoning for selecting the value of coarse category is provided in a comments column. There is the possibility that some description values did not get mapped into their optimum coarsedescription category, but the author is reasonably confident that the mapping is sensible. The 106 unique description values were mapped to 23 coarsedescription values. For a complete listing of the translation from description to coarsedescription, see Appendix A.

A pareto of total expenditure by coarsedescription is shown in Figure 10. The total for a given coarsedescription is computed simply by summing the values in the amount column for all records having that coarsedescription.

```r
desc_to_coarsedesc = read.csv("../dataset/description_to_coarsedescription.csv", na.strings='#N/A')
# we need to merge coarsedescription into Debt by description
Debt2=merge(Debt,desc_to_coarsedesc[c('description','coarsedescription')])

# Put 0 for position when there is no value
Debt2$position[is.na(Debt2$position)] <- 0
Debt2$legislativedistrict[is.na(Debt2$legislativedistrict)] <- 0

# sum amount by coarsedescription
amountbycoarsedesc <-aggregate(Debt2['amount'], by=list(coarsedescription=Debt2$coarsedescription), FUN=

#format method, which is necessary for formating in a data.frame
format.money  <- function(x, ...) {
  paste0("$", formatC(as.numeric(x), format="f", digits=2, big.mark=","))
}
class(amountbycoarsedesc$amount) <- c("money",class(amountbycoarsedesc$amount))


# sort the list descending, create pareto
amountbycoarsedesc <- amountbycoarsedesc[order(amountbycoarsedesc$amount, decreasing=TRUE),]
#print(amountbycoarsedesc)

nbars=14
topn=amountbycoarsedesc[1:nbars,]
?barplot
# bar plot tutorial https://www.statmethods.net/graphs/bar.html
barplot(topn$amount, main="Total Expenditures by Coarse Description",
        sub=paste(c("(Top", nbars, "shown)"), collapse = " "),
    xlab="Coarse Description",
    names.arg=topn$coarsedescription,
    cex.names=0.65)
```



```
# Maybe I should make a function for bar charts, since I will be making many of them.
```

Do the parties spend their money differently?

The expenditures by category can be broken down by political party to see differences in how Republicans and Democrats allocate their expenses. Since the total expenditures were so different between the parties, rather than look at the raw dollar amounts, the data were normalized to fraction of total expenditure for a given party. Since there were only $102.88 in expenditures for Independent candidates (0.04% of total), all spent in a single coarse category (Mailing Services), Indpendent party data were excluded from this specific analysis.

Figure 12 shows a pareto of fraction of party total expenditure by coarse description, by party. The data reveal that Democrats and Non-partisan candidates spent a greater fraction of money on consulting than the Republicans, while Republicans spent a greater fraction on credit card payments and telecom expenses. Unfortunately, there is no visibility into what purchases were made using the credit cards (the raw description column just named the credit card (e.g., AMEX), so it provides no additional information, either.)

```
# Rename "subject" column to "N"
names(amountbyparty)[names(amountbyparty)=="amount"] <- "totalamountbyparty"

#rollup debt2 by coarsedesc and party
expense_by_coarsedesc_by_party <-aggregate(Debt2['amount'],                                   by=


#merge totalamount into expense_by_coarsedesc_by_party
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party <- merge(expense_by_coarsedesc_by_party,amountbyparty)
```

```
# compute fraction
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party$fractionofpartytotal <- frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party$amount / frac_by_coarsed

# drop independents
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party <- frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party[frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party$party != "INDEPEN

# get max frac by coarsedescription (across parties)
maxfrac_by_coarsedesc <-aggregate(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party['fractionofpartytotal'],
                                           by=list(coarsedescription=frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party$coarsed

# Rename "fractionofpartytotal" column to "maxfracofpartytotal"
names(maxfrac_by_coarsedesc)[names(maxfrac_by_coarsedesc)=="fractionofpartytotal"] <- "maxfracofpartytot

#merge maxfrac into frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2=merge(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party,maxfrac_by_coarsedesc)


# assign part number to put nonpartisan last
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$partynumber<-ifelse(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$party=="DEMOCRAT",1,
        ifelse(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$party=="REPUBLICAN",2,3
        ))

#Now, sort the df by maxfracofpartytotal desc, then by partynumber
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2 <- frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2[order(-frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$maxfrac
                                                                   frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$partynum

# Now we can finally make a grouped pareto!
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$barlabels <- ""
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$barlabels <- frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$barlabels <-


# Trick Make labels which are non blank only when row mod 3 =2
x<-1:nrow(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2)
y <- x%%3==2

cd=frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$coarsedescription
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$barlabels <- with(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2, ifelse(y,cd,"" ) )

cd <- frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$coarsedescription
frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$barlabels <- ifelse(y,frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$coarsedescription,"" )


# now make a sidebyside bar chart
barplot(frac_by_coarsedesc_by_party2$fractionofpartytotal, main="Fractional Expenditures by Coarse Descr
        xlab="Coarse Description", col=c("blue","red","green"),
        legend = c("Democrat","Republican","Non Partisan"), beside=TRUE, names.arg=frac_by_coarsedesc_by
```



For Which Types of Offices is the Most Money Spent?

An analysis of amount of expenditure by office was performed by summing the amounts spent by unique value of the office2 column (the office column from the right half of the dataset). However, since the number of offices of a given type varied (there are more state representatives than state senators or governors), and since the number of candidates varied by office type, the amounts were divided by the number of unique combinations of legislativedistrict, position, and party within each office2 value. The intent of this was to normalize the amounts to a "per campaign" value. For example, there were 39 unique candidates for state representative. In Washington, there are two state representatives per legislative district, and the position column designates which of these two slots a row belongs to. The party column provides another level of granularity for a given line item. A pareto of expenditures per campaign by office is shown in Figure 13. Note that since the dataset does not have a unique candidate identifier, such as a number or registration ID, multiple candidates of the same party with expenditures for the same office and position would be treated as a single candidate.

The pareto shows that the race for governor had the greatest expenditure per candidate. Two other statewide offices, treasurer and attorney general, showed the next highest expenditures per candidate.

```
# get sum of amount by DUMMY
#sumbyoffice <- aggregate(Debt2['amount'],
#by=list(office=Debt2$DUMMY), FUN=sum)

# get sum(amount) and n rows by unique value of DUMMY, legislativedistrict, position, and party,
# and jurisdictiontype (in case I summarize by that later).
sumbycand <- aggregate(Debt2['amount'],
by=list(office=Debt2$office, legislativedistrict=Debt2$legislativedistrict, position=Debt2$position, pa
# now sum the amounts in sumbycand and count rows by office
sumbyoffice <- aggregate(sumbycand['amount'], by=list(office=sumbycand$office), FUN=sum)
countbyoffice <- aggregate(sumbycand['position'], by=list(office=sumbycand$office), FUN=length)

# Rename cols
names(sumbyoffice)[names(sumbyoffice)=="amount"] <- "totalamount"
names(countbyoffice)[names(countbyoffice)=="position"] <- "ncandidates"

# merge the sum and count data
amountperjob <- merge(sumbyoffice,countbyoffice)
amountperjob$mean_amount <- amountperjob$totalamount / amountperjob$ncandidates

# sort by mean_amount desc
# sort the list descending, create pareto
amountperjob <- amountperjob[order(amountperjob$mean_amount, decreasing=TRUE),]

# bar plot tutorial https://www.statmethods.net/graphs/bar.html
barplot(amountperjob$mean_amount, main="Expenditure per Candidate by Office",
    xlab="Office",
    names.arg=amountperjob$office,
    cex.names=1, las=2)
```



Do Different Jurisdiction Types Have Different Transaction Sizes?

Campaigns for offices of different jurisdiction types are likely conducted differently. The dataset contains four unique values in its jurisdictiontypes column–judicial, legislative, local, and statewide. Box plots of transaction amounts by jurisdictiontypes are shown in Figure 13. To provide insight into the relative number of data points comprising each jurisdition type, the width of the boxes are drawn proportionally to the square root of the number of points. The plot shows that while there were several outlier points for legislative offices, the highest amounts were in the outliers in the statewide offices. The three outlier expenditure amounts for statewide offices were all for consulting expenses, whereas the outliers for legislative offices spanned many categories, including mailing services, graphic design and printing, telecom, consulting, and web and data services. The single outlier for judicial offices was also consulting. The single outlier expense for local offices was for a credit card payment (to Cabela's, a hunting, fishing, and caping supply store, oddly enough).

The small dataset size of 194 total points, and the disparate number of points by jurisdiction type (Judicial: 14; Legislative: 125; Local: 19; and Statewide: 36) may limit the insight obtained by the box plots, but examination of the outlier points give some indication that consulting fees are some of the most expensive transactions in political campaigns for most types of political offices in Washington.

```
?boxplot
# Expenditure amounts by jurisdictiontype
boxplot(amount~jurisdictiontype,data=Debt2, main="Transaction Dollar Amounts by Jurisdiction Type",
    xlab="Jurisdiction Type", ylab="Amount in Dollars", varwidth=T)
```



Do Expenditures Change with Time?

As a final investigation, the change in spending amounts over time was examined. The data were grouped by month, using the thrudate value, which represents the end of the reporting period. Every unique value of thrudate was the last day of a given month, with the exception of July, 2012. For this month, there were two distinct thrudate values (7/16 and 7/30). For the s Every unThe thrudate value was chosen as the time value to use, since that is when expenditures are reported and since it groups expenditures by month. Trend plots of the sum, count, and average expenditure amount vs. thrudate are shown in Figures 15-17, respectively. The trends show that both the number of expenditures and the dollar amount of individual expenditures generally increased as the election drew near.

```
# Time component
```

Just what are "Treasury" Expenditures?

Figures 15-17 show expenditures attributable to the 2012 election as far back as 2009. These may or may not be erroneous data. Investigation of the descriptions of expenditures in the earliest months indicate that the majority of expenditures through February of 2011 were described as Treasury expenditures. To understand the significance of these expenditures, a dummy variable, Treasury, was created which was set to 1 for treasury expenses and 0 for all other categories. The mean of this dummy variable by thrudate (the average fraction of individual expenditures in a month attributable to Treasury) was plotted vs. thrudate. The plot shows that after February of 2011, the fraction of expenditures with this description decreases significantly, as other expense categories become more numerous. There are 57 records of Treasury expenses in the dataset, of which 54 have the value "Operations and Overhead" in the code column. The average amount of treasury expenses is $278. Without further domain knowledge, one cannot know the exact meaning of these expenses, but perhaps these are monthly fees paid for the services of each campaign's treasurer.

```
# Time component

# Copy Debt2 to Debt3
Debt3 <- Debt2



# Create dummy variable, TREASURY
Debt3$Treasury<-ifelse(Debt3$coarsedescription=="TREASURY",1,0)
# Let's make a debtmonth column
library(lubridate)
```

```
##
## Attaching package: 'lubridate'

## The following object is masked from 'package:base':
##
##     date
```

```
# Get just the month
Debt3$truedebtdate<-mdy(Debt3$debtdate)
Debt3$debtmonth<-floor_date(Debt3$truedebtdate, unit="month")
# Make it look cute
#Debt3$debtmonth<- format(Debt3$debtmonth, format="%M/%D/%Y")
# Make str version so it will be a factor
Debt3$debtmonthstr<- as.character(Debt3$debtmonth)



##need plyr package to use ddply
library(plyr)
```

```
##
## Attaching package: 'plyr'

## The following object is masked from 'package:lubridate':
##
##     here
```

```
# Now get sum, count, and mean of amount and mean of Treasury by debtmonthstr

##summarize data. Because R categorized Day as a factor we can go ahead and use this
```

```
timestats<- ddply(Debt3,~debtmonthstr,summarise,Sum_amount=sum(amount), Count_amount = length(amount),
      Mean_amount = mean(amount), Mean_Treasury = mean(Treasury))


#Create debtmonth in timestats, as a date (this works but format is not good for graphing)
timestats$debtmonth<- strptime(timestats$debtmonthstr,"%Y-%m-%d")

# format it to MM/YYYY
# I believe this sets it back to char!
#timestats$debtmonth<- format(timestats$debtmonth, format="%Y/%m")



# sort by it
timestats<- timestats[order(timestats$debtmonth),]


xvector=timestats$debtmonth
yvector=timestats$Sum_amount
yvector2=timestats$Count_amount
yvector3=timestats$Mean_amount
plot(xvector, yvector,xlab="Reporting Period",  ylab="Sum of Expenditures", main="Sum of Amount")
```



```
plot(xvector, yvector2,xlab="Reporting Period",  ylab="Number of Expenditures", main="Count of Amount")
```



```
plot(xvector, yvector3,xlab="Reporting Period",  ylab="Mean of Expenditures", main="Mean of Amount")
```



What jurisdiction types to parties spend their money on?

Interesting observations: - Democrats outspent all others on Legislative and Statewide elections - Republicans focused on Legislative and Local elections - Non partisians outspent all others on Judicial and Local elections

```
party_jurtype_sum <- aggregate(Debt['amount'],
                                  by=list(party=Debt$party,
                                          jurisdictiontype=Debt$jurisdictiontype),
                                  FUN=sum)

# Order by total spending
xtab_sum <- xtabs(amount ~ jurisdictiontype + party, data=party_jurtype_sum)
xtab_sum <- xtab_sum[,order(colSums(xtab_sum), decreasing = TRUE)]

xtab_sum_mat <- data.matrix(xtab_sum)
barplot(xtab_sum_mat,
        beside = TRUE,
        legend.text = rownames(xtab_sum_mat),
        main = "Total party debt across jurisdiction types",
        xlab = "party",
        ylab = "total debt amount")
```



Analysis of Secondary Effects . . .

Secondary effects. . .

Jurisdiction Types vs Party counts?

Party vs Office counts?

Conclusion

Debt amount is highly skewed in the positive direction.

Statewide amounts have the largest skew of the jurisdiction types

Total expendatures for democrats far exceed those for all other parties combined

Conclusion…