

Exercise 4.1 – Evaluation of Visualization Examples

Number 11:

Information overhead. User has to convert from avocado toasts to dollars with two different prices for a single avocado toast for each Berlin and Tokyo. The amount of avocado toasts can't be compared intuitively. Secondly, the depiction of dollars in the bottom quarter of the plot uses too much space and the amount of dollar bills is not proportional to the avocado toast price. The glyph is used in a wrong way. Furthermore, the metaphor of one avocado toast for 100 avocado toasts is not fitting.

Number 12:

The governors' faces are used as glyphs, but the size of the glyphs does not correlate with the salary. The state names are not visualized. Therefore, the salaries of governors from different states can't be compared directly. The visualization fails to provide the user with relevant information and comparable depictions. Additionally, it is not clear to which governor the footnote at the bottom of the visualization refers to until a successful search for the mentioned governor. This might confuse and annoy the user.

Number 13:

First of all, this visualization uses too much decorative elements (3D effects, color ramp, etc.), which clutters the visualization and makes it harder to read.

But much more serious is the distortion of the data:

The data for Netflix is from June 2011 to November 2013 and the data for Tesla is from January 2019 to today. Yet the line charts have the same starting point. The end point of the Tesla stock is deliberately (?) set way too early to match the decreasing stock of Netflix in 2011. This could be a deliberate decision in order to support the statement of the title suggestively.

This visualization does not provide the user with information, but tries to actively influence the user's interpretation of the data.

Number 14:

Coloring of imports and exports are not consistent. This makes it harder to compare the U.S. trade with China and Taiwan. Furthermore, the visualization seems to be a stacked line chart. But it isn't, which can be detected only in the visualization of U.S. trade with China during 1976.