What we're up against

a cucumber.

Tabular Display of Data

STAT8801 Statistical Consulting

School of Statistics University of Minnesota

March 19, 2012

Perhaps not that bad, but a challenge.

Examples from Ehrenberg (1977, JRSSA) and Wainer (1997, JEBS).

Getting information from a table is like extracting sunlight from

Farguhar and Farguhar, 1891, p55

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

March 19, 2012

March 19, 2012

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Eye on the ball

Most displays only do one thing well.

To build any effective display we must have a firm notion of purpose. We cannot know what the best answers are unless we know what the questions are. Thus we must first understand what questions will be asked of data. Any discussion of data display in the abstract is pointless.

Wainer (1997 JEBS)

We will concentrate on communication.

Back to communication

A display for communication should

- Target an audience
- Have a goal (tell a story)
- Make the story obvious
- Be uncluttered
- Cause no pain

It's a lot like oral communication!

March 19, 2012 March 19, 2012 STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Rules for Communication

Ehrenberg, Wainer, and many others give rules/advice.

We illustrate with examples from their papers.

Remember, we want to communicate, to show a story, which could be

- Big picture
- Trends
- Comparisons
- Typical values
- Atypical values

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

March 19, 2012

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

March 19, 2012

Round Drastically

Use two significant figures where ever possible.

- Don't usually understand more than two digits Budget is \$27,329,681 versus budget is 27 million dollars.
- Rarely justify more than two digits statistically God gave us $1/\sqrt{n}$, but how big must *n* be for that third digit?
- We rarely care Life expectancy 67.14 years; .01 year is about 4 days.
- Not for archival tables.

Ehrenberg's Criteria

Strong Criterion for Good Table

The patterns and exceptions in a table should be obvious at a glance.

Weak Criterion for Good Table

The patterns and exceptions in a table should be obvious at a glance once one has been told what they are.

Always meet the weak criterion.

Order Rows/Columns Sensibly

Helps organize and facilitate comparison

- Alphabetical (Alabama first!) almost never correct
- Could be by size
- Could be a natural order, such as time
- By interest (rows or columns to compare should be adjacent)

March 19, 2012 March 19, 2012 STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Row/Column Summaries

Transpose

Give a standard for comparison

- Could be mean/median/total/etc
- Give a visual focus
- Provide a standard of "usual"
- An overall summary can also help
- Can highlight for emphasis

It's easier to compare numbers down columns.

- Numbers are closer
- Digits line up

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Tabular Display of Data

March 19, 2012

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

abular Display of Dat

March 19 2012

10 / 25

Layout/Spacing

- Remove excess lines/boxing
- Use space to emphasize groups/gaps
- Excess space breaks adjacency

What is a stem and leaf plot, but a severely rounded table with meaningful spacing?

More tips

- Don't try to put to much data in a table; multivariate tables are especially difficult.
- Add good titles and explanatory text. The table with its labels, title, and accompanying text should stand alone and be comprehensible.
- Emphasize unusual values

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) Tabular Display of Data March 19, 2012 11 / 25 STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) Tabular Display of Data March 19, 2012 12 / 2

Summary

A table should be designed to tell a specific story to a particular audience. Useful tips include:

- Round Appropriately
- Order Rows/Columns Sensibly
- Add Row/Column Summaries
- Transpose for easy comparison
- Clean layout/proper spacing
- Avoid multivariate tables
- Add labels, titles, explanatory text
- Emphasize unusual values

March 19, 2012

Examples

- Start on the top side. Does the table meet the strong criterion? the weak criterion? Why or why not? What would you change?
- Then open up the bottom. What changed? Is this table easier to understand? Why or why not?

Reminder of Summary:

- Round Appropriately
- Order Rows/Columns Sensibly
- Add Row/Column Summaries
- Transpose for easy comparison
- Clean layout/proper spacing
- Avoid multivariate tables
- Add labels, titles, explanatory text
- Emphasize unusual values

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

March 19, 2012

UK Vessels (Ehrenberg, 1977)

UK Merchant Vessels over 500 tons in Service							
	1962	1967	1973				
Number of vessels							
All vessels	2,689	2,181	1,776				
Passenger	242	173	122				
Dry cargo	1,847	1,527	1,165				
Tankers	600	481	489				
Deadweight in thousands of tons							
All vessels	26,577	27,488	46,763				
Passenger	1,467	919	349				
Dry cargo	13,990	14,362	20,115				
Tankers	11,120	12,167	26,299				

UK Vessels - After

IIK Merchant Vessels in Service

Vessels over 500 tons	1962	1967	1973
Number			
Passenger	240	170	120
Tankers	600	480	490
Dry cargo	1,800	1,500	1,200
All vessels	2,700	2,200	1,800
Deadweight tons (thousands)			
Passenger	1,500	920	350
Tankers	11,000	12,000	26,000
Dry cargo	14,000	14,000	20,000
All vessels	26,000	27,000	47,000

March 19, 2012 March 19, 2012 STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

TV Correlations (Ehrenberg)

Correlation among TV audiences

		PrB	ThW	Tod	WoS	GrS	LnU	MoD	Pan	RgS	24H
ITV	PrB	1.000	0.106	0.065	0.505	0.474	0.092	0.473	0.168	0.309	0.124
"	ThW	0.106	1.000	0.270	0.142	0.132	0.189	0.082	0.352	0.064	0.395
"	Tod	0.065	0.270	1.000	0.093	0.070	0.155	0.038	0.200	0.051	0.244
"	WoS	0.505	0.147	0.093	1.000	0.622	0.079	0.581	0.187	0.297	0.140
BBC	GrS	0.474	0.132	0.070	0.622	1.000	0.085	0.593	0.181	0.341	0.142
"	LnU	0.092	0.189	0.155	0.079	0.085	1.000	0.049	0.197	0.097	0.266
"	MoD	0.473	0.082	0.039	0.581	0.593	0.049	1.000	0.131	0.327	0.122
"	Pan	0.168	0.352	0.200	0.187	0.181	0.197	0.131	1.000	0.147	0.524
"	RgS	0.309	0.064	0.051	0.296	0.341	0.097	0.326	0.147	1.000	0.121
"	24H	0.124	0.395	0.244	0.140	0.142	0.266	0.122	0.524	0.121	1.000

TV Correlations – After

Correlation among TV audiences

Programmes		WoS	MoD	GrS	PrB	RgS	24H	Pan	ThW	Tod	LnU
World of Sport	ITV		.6	.6	.5	.3	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1
Match of the Day	BBC	.6		.6	.5	.3	.1	.1	.1	.0	.0
Grandstand	BBC	.6	.6		.5	.3	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1
Prof. Boxing	ITV	.5	.5	.5		.3	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1
Rugby Special	BBC	.3	.3	.3	.3		.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
24 Hours	BBC	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1		.5	.4	.2	.2
Panorama	BBC	.2	.1	.2	.2	.1	.5		.4	.2	.2
This Week	ITV	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.4	.4		.3	.2
Today	ITV	.1	.0	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2	.3		.2
Line Up	BBC	.1	.0	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	

March 19, 2012

Unemployment (Ehrenberg)

Unemployment in Great Britain (thousands)

	1966	1968	1970	1973
Total unemployed	330.9	549.4	582.2	597.9
Males	259.6	460.7	495.3	499.4
Females	71.3	88.8	86.9	98.5

Unemployment – After

Unemployment in Great Britain (thousands)

Year	Male	Female	Total
1966	260	71	330
1968	460	89	550
1970	500	87	580
1973	500	99	600
Average	430	86	520

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) March 19, 2012 STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) March 19, 2012

Battery Life (Wainer)

Battery Life – After

Battery Life in Hours

Battery	Cassette			Portable					
Brand	Player	Radio	Flashlight	Computer					
Constant Charge	5	19	10	3					
Electro-Blaster	10	26	15	4					
Never Die	8	28	16	6					
PowerBat	7	24	13	5					
Servo-Cell	4	21	12	2					

Battery Cass. Port. Brand Flash. Player **Brand** Radio Comp. **Averages** 28 16 8 15 Never Die 6 Electro-Blaster 26 15 10 14 4 PowerBat 24 13 5 12 Servo-Cell 21 12 2 10 10 Constant Charge 19 3 9 Usage averages 24 13 12

Battery Life in Hours

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Fabular Display of Data

March 19, 2012 21

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Tabular Display of Data

March 19, 2012 22

Avoid if you can

If you can, avoid multidimensional tables, or tables with too many rows or columns.

	Grade 8 - 1992										
	Graduate	Graduated College Some Education After High School			Graduated	Graduated High School		Did Not Finish High School		1 Don't Know	
PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Percentage of Students	Average Proficiency	Percentage of Students	Average Proficiency	Percentage of Students	Average Proficiency	Percentage of Students	Average Proficiency	Percentage of Students	Average Proficienc	
NATION	40 (1.4)	279 (1.4)	18 (0.6)	270 (1.2)	25 (0.8)	256 (1,4)	8 (0.6)	248 (1.8)	9 (0.5)	251 (1.7	
Northeast	38 (3.1)	282 (4.2)	18 (1.1)	267 (3.0)	26 (2.2)	259 (4.2)	8 (0.9)	246 (4.2)	10 (1.2)	250 (3.3	
Southeast	35 (1.9)	270 (1.9)	17 (0.8)	263 (2.0)	28 (1.4)	249 (1.9)	12 (1.6)	246 (4.2)	8 (1.0)	248 (4.3	
Central	42 (2.7)	283 (2.9)	20 (1.4)	273 (1.6)	26 (1.7)	264 (2.3)	4 (0.7)	()	7 (0.8)	258 (3.8)	
West	43 (2.9)	279 (2.6)	18 (1.2)	274 (2.6)	19 (1.5)	252 (2.9)	9 (1.1)	248 (2.4)	11 (0.9)	248 (2.9	
STATES	(4.0)	(410)	(-166)		(1.00)	(2.0)	- (1.1)	(4.4)	(0.5)	2.0 (2.0)	
Alabama	33 (1.6)	261 (2.5)	18 (0.7)	258 (2.0)	29 (1.1)	244 (1.8)	13 (0.9)	239 (2.0)	7 (0.6)	237 (2.9)	
Arizona	36 (1.5)	277 (1.5)	22 (1.0)	270 (1.5)	21 (0.9)	256 (1.6)	10 (0.7)	245 (2.5)	12 (0.8)	248 (2.7)	
Arkansas	30 (1.1)	264 (1.9)	20 (0.8)	264 (1.7)	31 (1.1)	248 (1.6)	11 (0.7)	246 (2.4)	8 (0.6)	245 (2.7)	
California	39 (1.8)	275 (2.0)	18 (1.0)	266 (2.1)	17 (0.9)	251 (2.1)	10 (0.9)	241 (2.2)	16 (1.1)	240 (2.9)	
Colorado	46 (1.2)	282 (1.3)	19 (0.9)	276 (1.6)	21 (0.9)	260 (1.5)>		250 (2.4)	7 (0.5)	252 (2.6)	
Connecticut	47 (1.3)	288 (1.0)>		272 (1.8)	22 (0.9)	260 (1.8)	6 (0.6)	245 (3.3)	9 (0.6)	251 (2.4)	
Delaware	39 (1.2)	274 (1,3)	18 (1,0)	268 (2.3)	30 (1.0)	251 (1.7)	6 (0.5)	248 (4,0)	8 (0.9)	248 (3.4	
Dist. Columbia	32 (1.0)	244 (1.7)	17 (0.8)	240 (1.9)	29 (0.8)	224 (1.6)	9 (0.7)	225 (3.2)	12 (0.6)	229 (2.2	
Florida	39 (1.5)	268 (1,9)	19 (0.7)	266 (1.9)	24 (1.1)	251 (1.8)	8 (0.7)	244 (2.7)	10 (0.7)	244 (3.2	
Georgia	35 (1.7)	271 (2.1)	18 (0.7)	264 (1.7)	30 (1.2)	250 (1,3)	11 (0.8)	244 (2.2)	6 (0.6)	245 (2.6)	
Hawaii	38 (1.1)	267 (1.5)	15 (0.9) <		25 (1.0)	246 (1.8)	6 (0.5)	242 (3.5)	16 (0.8)	246 (2.1)	
Idaho	48 (1.2)	281 (0.9)	20 (0.8)	278 (1.3)	19 (0.9)	268 (1.4) >		254 (2.3)	6 (0.5)	254 (2.8)	
Indiana	33 (1.5)	283 (1.5)	21 (0.9)	275 (1.9)	32 (1.1)	260 (1.6)	8 (0.6)	250 (2.6)	6 (0.5)	249 (3.3)	
lowa	44 (1.4)	291 (1.2)>		285 (1.5)	25 (1.1)	273 (1.3)	4 (0.4)	262 (2.4)	5 (0.4)	266 (2.8)	
Kentucky	28 (1.4)	278 (1.6)3		267 (1.6)	32 (0.9)	254 (1.6)	15 (0.9)	246 (1.7)	6 (0.4)	242 (2.8)	
Louisiana	32 (1.4)	256 (2.5)	20 (0.9)	259 (1.8)	30 (1,3)	242 (1.6)	10 (0.7)	237 (2.4)	7 (0.6)	236 (3.7)	
Maine	40 (1.5)	288 (1.4)	22 (1.0)	281 (1.5)	26 (1.1)	267 (1.1)	6 (0.5)	259 (2.7)	5 (0.5)	266 (2.6)	
Maryland	44 (1.7)	278 (1.8)	18 (0.9)	266 (1.9)	25 (1.2)	250 (1.8)	6 (0.8)	240 (3.7)	7 (0.5)	245 (3.8)	
Massachusetts	48 (1.5)	284 (1.3)	17 (0.8)	272 (1.8)	21 (1.0)	261 (1.4)	7 (0.6)	248 (3.2)	7 (0.6)	248 (2.6)	
Michigan	38 (1.6)	277 (2.2)	23 (0.9)	271 (2.0)	26 (0.9)	257 (1.7)	6 (0.5)	249 (2.0)	7 (0.6)	248 (3.0)	
Minnesota	48 (1.3) >	290 (1.0)>		284 (1.8)	22 (0.9) <<		3 (0.4)	256 (4.2)	7 (0.6)	268 (3.0)	
Mississippi	36 (1.7)	254 (1.6)	16 (0.7)	256 (2.0)	29 (1.4)	239 (1.6)	13 (0.8)	234 (1.8)	7 (0.6)	231 (2.8	
Missouri	36 (1.3)	280 (1.7)	22 (0.9)	275 (1.5)	29 (1.0)	264 (1.6)	8 (0.7)	254 (2.4)	6 (0.5)	252 (2.9)	
Nebraska	46 (1.5)	287 (1.2)	20 (1.0)	280 (1.6)	24 (1.2)	267 (1.7)	4 (0.5)	247 (3.3)	6 (0.6)	256 (3.8)	

Hard to see anything!
But perhaps useful for archival purposes.

Add verbal descriptions

Consumers' (C) and Retailers' (R) ratings of the nutritional and economic values of different foods

Foods	Nu	tritional	Economic		
	C	R	C	R	
Meat	62	58	14	11	
Milk	55	52	44	95	
Eggs	49	48	85	61	
Cheese	45	52	30	62	
Fresh Veg.	42	24	25	18	
Fish	33	52	20	10	
Chicken	18	13	70	25	
Bread	5	11	5	21	

*In decreasing order of Consumers' Nutritional Ratings.

... hard to interpret without a <u>verbal description</u> perhaps "Consumers and retailers agree quite well on nutritional ratings, but economic ratings differ from each other and from the nutritional ones."

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) Tabular Display of Data March 19, 2012 23

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota)

Tabular Display of Dat

March 19, 2012 24

Point out Exceptions

Point out unusual values

	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Graduated College	Some Education After High School	Graduated High School	Did Not Finish High School	l Don't Know	Mean
	Nation	279	270	256	248	251	267
	States						
1	lowa	291	285	273	262	266	283
2	North Dakota	289	283	271	259	272	283
3	Minnesota	290	284	270	256	268	282
4	Maine	288	281	267	259	266	278
5	Wisconsin	287	282	270	254	255	278
6	New Hampshire	287	280	267	259	262	278
7	Nebraska	287	280	267	247 -	256	277
8	idaho		278	268	254	254	274
9	Wyoming		278	266	258	260	274
10	Utah		278	258	254	258	274
11	Connecticut	288	272	260	245 -	251	273

STAT8801 (Univ. of Minnesota) Tabular Display of Data March 19, 2012 25 / 25