Question 1: “Bar 10” is the better visualization of this data. The abbreviated scale in “Bar 9” creates an exaggerated sense of the relative difference between the data presented for the NY Yankees and Box Red Sox. Breaking the scale, as “Bar 9” does, implies a significance that is not borne out in complete data analysis. “Bar 10” maintains scale and demonstrates a fair comparison of the Yankees and Red Sox victories for the viewer.

Question 2: The “Taxes at the Pump” graph is misleading in three ways. First, it appears that the state taxes are represented twice (in both “state” and “state & local” categories). This makes the overall total taxes paid appear greater than it is. Second, the listed taxes are stacked on top of the “Per Gal. Nat’l. avg.” which already includes those taxes. They literally presented as a cost on top of the total instead of as part of the total. Finally, the scale or relative size of each category should be proportional. As presented, they are not which, again, misleads the viewer.

Question 3: Both the title and the scale of the graph “Unemployment Level by Random Quarter” are misleading. First, the title clearly states *random* quarter. In fact, there is nothing random. The dates are presented and labeled in sequence from June 207 through June 2010, by month. This leads to the second problem. Though the title says *by quarter* the data is shown by month. Doing so clutters the graph and shortens the data between points, effectively skewing the scale so changes from quarter to quarter are not apparent.

Comment on Question 3: Not sure about this, but it also seems that the data is cumulative. By this I mean it does not show the change from quarter to quarter just the new total. Thoughts?

Question 4: The more accurate graph depicting “Most Dangerous Cities” is on the right-hand-side with the subtitle “Murder Rate in Major U.S. Cities in 2014, per 100,000 People.” This graph is more accurate because it defines parameters and gives context to the number of murders shown. For example, if a city with 100 people has 56 murders, it is clearly more dangerous than a city with 100,000 people and 56 murders. The proportion gives context to the violence.

Question 5: The graph comparing the U.S. unemployment rate with Hillary Clinton’s approval rate from June 2014 to May 2015 implies, at a minimum, correlation. I would argue that it also implies causation – essentially, Clinton’s approval rating was dependent on high unemployment. As unemployment shrunk, so to did Clinton’s approval rating. The scale of this graph also negatively impacts the nuance a reader can draw from it.