Spring 2016
Points: 25

Consider the following variable description from the RateMyProfessor dataset. This data is provided on our course website.

| Variable / Field | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| Table_ID | Used to uniquely identify each row of the dataset, 7448 unique values: 1,2, .., 7448 |
| College | College for which the faculty member teaches. 11 unique values: Chicago, CMU, <br> Tufts, Duke, UTexas, Harvard, Yale, MIT, Stanford, Princeton, Rice |
| Department | Department in which the faculty member teaches. 140 unique values: Accounting, <br> Advertising, ..., Writing |
| Name | Name of Faculty Member, 7413 unique values: Abbott, Andrew, Achar, Pramod, ..., <br> Zodrow, George |
| Total Ratings | Number of Rate My Professor reviews. Min=0, Max = 116 |
| Overall Quality | Average overall quality score. Min=1, Max=5 |
| Easiness | Average easiness score. Min=1, Max=5 |
| Hot | An indicator of whether or not the faculty member is considered hot by at least one <br> reviewer |

Table name: Professors

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Table ID - | College - | Department - | Name * | Total Ratings ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | Overall Quality - | Easiness - | Hot |
| 2 | 1 | UChicago | Sociology | Abbott, AI | 6 | 2 | 1.3 | Not Hot |
| 3 | 2 | UChicago | Mathematics | Achar, Pra | 6 | 4.4 | 2.8 | Hot |
| 4 | 3 | UChicago | English | Alexandeı | 1 | 1 | 5 | Not Hot |
| 5 | 4 | UChicago | Social Work | Allard, Scc | 5 | 3.2 | 2.4 | Not Hot |
| 6 | 5 | UChicago | Classics | Ando, Clif | 1 | 5 | 5 | Not Hot |
| 7 | 6 | UChicago | Science | Archer, Dá | 12 | 4.1 | 2.7 | Hot |
| 8 | 7 | UChicago | Religion | Arnold, Di | 0 |  |  | Not Hot |
| 9 | 8 | UChicago | English | Atkinson, | 1 | 5 | 4 | Hot |
| 10 | 9 | UChicago | History | Austen, R | 20 | 1.9 | 1.9 | Not Hot |
| 11 |  | UChicaso | Mathematics | Rahai. I as | 3 | 4.5 | 1.3 | Not Hot |

1. Consider the following applications of the $=\operatorname{COUNT}()$ function in Excel. (4 pts)

Version A: =COUNT(Professors[College])
Version B: =COUNT(Professors[Total Ratings])
Version C: =COUNT(Professors[Overall Quality])

| Version A: | 0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Version B: | 7448 |
| Version C: | 6441 |

a. Which version produces the correct number of rows in this dataset? Discuss.

Version B appears to be correct. The number of rows in this dataset is 7448.
b. Figure out what Version A is doing. Why does this not produce the correct value?

The =COUNT() function counts the number of cells that contain numbers.
c. Find an alternative to the COUNT() function to obtain the count using the Professors[College] column. Verify that this function produces the desired value.

```
Two versions provided here - other versions may exist.
    - =COUNTA(Professors[College])
    - =COUNTIF(Professors[College],"<>")
```

d. Why does Version C produce a value that is different than Version B?

> Simply because not all professors in this list have an Overall quality score. In fact, $7448-6441=1007$ professors do not have an overall quality score.
2. What is the average overall quality rating for all professors? (1 pt)

$$
\text { =AVERAGE(Professors[Overall Quality]) = } 3.815
$$

3. Using the =AVERAGEIF() function, obtain the average overall quality rating by college. Rank/sort the colleges from highest average overall score to lowest. (3 pts)

| College |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Harvard | 4.036 |
| Princeton | 3.964 |
| MIT | 3.926 |
| Stanford | 3.905 |
| UChicago | 3.893 |
| Rice | 3.864 |
| Tufts | 3.797 |
| Duke | 3.793 |
| Yale | 3.786 |
| CMU | 3.770 |
| UTexas | 3.746 |

4. Using the =AVERAGEIF() function, obtain the average overall quality rating by Hot. Can we say that a faculty member that is considered hot by at least one reviewer tends to have a higher average overall quality score? How much does Hotness appear to affect the average overall quality score? Briefly discuss. (3 pts)

| Hot | 4.367 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Not Hot | 3.561 |

The average overall quality score for a Hot professor is 4.4 and those not considered hot is 3.6. Thus, it appears that when a professor is considered Hot, we can expect their overall quality score to increase by 0.8 or so.
5. Using the $=\operatorname{COUNTIF}()$ function in Excel to obtain the total number of reviews by Department. (2 pts)

| Original Order |  | Sorted alphabetically by Department |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | Total | Department | Total |
| Sociology | 140 | Accounting | 24 |
| Mathematics | 585 | Advertising | 15 |
| English | 506 | Advisor | 1 |
| Social Work | 32 | African Studies | 1 |
| Classics | 99 | African-American | 4 |
| Science | 146 | American Studies | 7 |
| Religion | 85 | Anthropology | 143 |
| Historv | 340 | Arabic | 3 |
| Uivati stuules | $\angle$ | sports | 1 |
| Chemical Enginee | 2 | statistics | 25 |
| African Studies | 1 | Studio Art | 7 |
| Russian Studies | 1 | Theater | 103 |
| Slavic Languages \& | 1 | Theology | 26 |
| Media Studies | 1 | Urban Planning | 3 |
| Media Arts | 1 | Urban Studies | 2 |
| Drama | 7 | Women | 1 |
| Mgmt Science \& E | 1 | Women's Studies | 28 |
| East Asian Laneua | 1 | Writing | 118 |

6. Use the =COUNTIFS() function in Excel, obtain the total number of Hot faculty members by Department. Repeat to obtain the total number of Not Hot faculty members by Department. Use these value to obtain the \% of faculty members that are consider Hot by Department. Finally, sort this list to obtain the following. (6 pts)

My =COUNTIFS() function is provided below. Need to check two conditions (Department, and Hot). The M\$25 will force Excel to use row 25 when copy down is used to obtain counts for remaining Departments.


Top and Bottom 5 after sorting by \% Hot.

| Top 5 Departments for Hotness |  |  |  |  |  | Bottom 5 Departments for Hotness |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | Total | Hot | Not Hot | \% Hot | \% Not Hot | Department | Total | Hot | Not Hot | \% Hot | \% Not Hot |
| Women | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | oivilieurai | 1 | $\checkmark$ | 1 | v.v | suv.v |
| Dramatic Arts | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | Forestry | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Slavic Languages \& | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | African Studies | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Media Arts | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | Russian Studies | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Archaeology | 4 | 3 | 1 | 75.0 | 25.0 | Media Studies | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| African-American | 4 | 3 | 1 | 75.0 | 25.0 | Mgmt Science \& E | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| I atin 4 moriran St | 2 | $?$ | 1 | 667 | 22.2 | East Asian Langua | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Note: Several Departments have $0 \%$ Hot; thus, any of these 5 will suffice for bottom 5.

| Top 5 Departments for Hotness |  | Bottom 5 Departments for Hotness |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Women | 1 | African Studies |
| 2 | Dramatic Arts | 2 | Russian Studies |
| 3 | Slavic Languages \& Literatures | 3 | Media Studies |
| 4 | Media Arts | 4 | Mgmt Science \& Engineering |
| 5 | Archaeology | 5 | East Asian Languages |

7. Obtain a table akin to the one provided above, but here only include Departments that have a minimum of 10 reviews. This will prevent low counts from adversely influencing the rankings. (3 pts)

| Top 5 Departments for Hotness |  |  |  |  |  | Bottom 5 Departments for Hotness |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | Total | Hot | Not Hot | \% Hot | \% Not Hot | Department | Total | Hot | Not Hot | \% Hot | \% Not Hot |
| Physical Education | 14 | 8 | 6 | 57.1 | 42.9 | Geograpny | 26 | 4 | 22 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| Social Science | 55 | 26 | 29 | 47.3 | 52.7 | Chinese | 14 | 2 | 12 | 14.3 | 85.7 |
| German | 13 | 6 | 7 | 46.2 | 53.8 | Public Policy | 50 | 6 | 44 | 12.0 | 88.0 |
| Experimental College | 13 | 6 | 7 | 46.2 | 53.8 | International Studies | 17 | 1 | 16 | 5.9 | 94.1 |
| Physical Ed | 25 | 11 | 14 | 44.0 | 56.0 | Finance | 20 | 1 | 19 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
| French | 23 | 10 | 13 | 43.5 | 56.5 | Journalism | 22 | 1 | 21 | 4.5 | 95.5 |
| fthnir studias | 18 | 7 | 11 | 389 | 611 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Departments | 10 | m | e re | WS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Top 5 Departments for Hotness* |  |  | Bottom 5 Departments for Hotness* |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Physical Education | 1 | Chinese |  |
| 2 | Social Science | 2 | Public Policy |  |
| 3 | German | 3 | International Studies |  |
| 4 | Experimental College | 4 | Finance |  |
| 5 | Physical Ed | 5 | Journalism |  |
| *Departments with 10 or more reviews |  |  |  |  |

8. Use a Stacked Google Bar Chart (code provided below) to create a visualization of the table provided in the problem above. In order to successfully make this chart, you will need to calculate the \% Hot and \% Not Hot for each Department that is included on this graph.

- Top 5 and Bottom 5 as sorted by \% Hot.

| Department | Total | Hot | Not Hot | \% Hot | \% Not Hot |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Physical Education | 14 | 8 | 6 | 57.1 | 42.9 |
| Social Science | 55 | 26 | 29 | 47.3 | 52.7 |
| German | 13 | 6 | 7 | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| Experimental College | 13 | 6 | 7 | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| Physical Ed | 25 | 11 | 14 | 44.0 | 56.0 |
| rmanh | 12 | 10 | 12 | $12=$ | $\mathbf{c c}=$ |
| Chinese | 14 | 2 | 12 | 14.3 | 85.7 |
| Public Policy | 50 | 6 | 44 | 12.0 | 88.0 |
| International Studies | 17 | 1 | 16 | 5.9 | 94.1 |
| Finance | 20 | 1 | 19 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
| Journalism | 22 | 1 | 21 | 4.5 | 95.5 |

- The Javascript vector elements used to create the Google Stacked Bar Chart
['Physical Education',57.1,42.9],
['Social Science',47.3,52.7],
['German',46.2,53.8],
['Experimental College',46.2,53.8],
['Physical Ed',44,56],
['Chinese',14.3,85.7],
['Public Policy',12,88],
['International Studies',5.9,94.1],
['Finance',5,95],
['Journalism',4.5,95.5]
- The Google Stacked Bar Chart of \% Hot and \% Not Hot for the Top 5 and Bottom 5 departments.


