



# Generated Chart 1


1-0




1-1



1-2




1-3




1-4

---


More job opportunities and government policy encouraged immigration



1-12




1-13




1-14

---

More job opportunities and government policy encouraged immigration




1-23



1-24

---


More job opportunities and government policy encouraged immigration




1-34

---

More job opportunities and government policy encouraged immigration




More job opportunities and government policy encouraged immigration



# 1-annotation+

More job opportunities and government policy encouraged immigration




# 1-txt


Immigration levels were relatively steady for over six decades starting in 1960. A change in government policy and more job opportunities led to a sharp increase in 2018. The number of immigrants rose eight-fold in just a few years' time, rising from 250K to 2M.

# Generated Chart 2


2-0



2-1




2-2




2-3

After steadily increasing, median household income spiked in 2008




2-4

Steady increase from 1960-2008 was caused by an increase in base wages.




2-12




2-13

After steadily increasing, median household income spiked in 2008




2-14

Steady increase from 1960-2008 was caused by an increase in base wages.




2-23

After steadily increasing, median household income spiked in 2008



2-24


Steady increase from 1960-2008 was caused by an increase in base wages.



2-34


## After steadily increasing, median household income spiked in 2008

Steady increase from 1960-2008 was caused by an increase in base wages.



2-124


After steadily increasing, median household income spiked in 2008



# 2-annotation+

After steadily increasing, median household income spiked in 2008

Steady increase from 1960-2008 was caused by an increase in base wages.




## 2-txt


Median household income rose steadily from 1960 to 2008, at a rate of \$10K each decade. In 2008, on the basis of a strong job market and high wages, income spiked even higher. This change was relatively sudden. In just two years, median household income increased by \$20K, reaching \$80K in 2010.

# Generated Chart 3


3-0



3-1




3-2




### 3-3


Pivotal moment for stock index in 1962,  
decreasing rate changed dramatically



3-4




3-12




### 3-13

Pivotal moment for stock index in 1962,  
decreasing rate changed dramatically




3-14




3-23

Pivotal moment for stock index in 1962,  
decreasing rate changed dramatically

Stock index at 5 in 2010, less than in 1970




3-24




3-34

Pivotal moment for stock index in 1962,  
decreasing rate changed dramatically



3-134


Pivotal moment for stock index in 1962,  
decreasing rate changed dramatically



# 3-annotation+

Pivotal moment for stock index in 1962,  
decreasing rate changed dramatically

Stock index at 5 in 2010, less than in 1970




### 3-txt


During the national debt crisis of the 1960s, the stock index dropped dramatically from 4000 to 2800. In 1962, this decrease slowed, settling to a steady decline of 500 points per decade. By 2010, the stock index dwindled to just above 0.

# Generated Chart 4


4-0



4-1




4-2




4-3


After falling, household income increases.



4-4




4-12




4-13

After falling, household income increases.




4-14




4-23

After falling, household income increases.




4-24




4-34

After falling, household income increases.




4-234

After falling, household income increases.



# 4-annotation+

After falling, household income increases.




## 4-txt

From 1960 to 1980, the median household income remained steady at around \$20K. In 1981, thanks to a technological boom, median income skyrocketed to a high of \$80K. Just as quickly as it rose, income dropped to \$32K in 1990. After this drop, the following two decades experienced steady upward growth, increasing by around \$20K every decade. By 2010, median income had nearly reached its previous high.


# Generated Chart 5

5-0




5-1


## President approval rating over 5 years (2015-2020)




5-2



5-3




5-4




5-12

## President approval rating over 5 years (2015-2020)




5-13

## President approval rating over 5 years (2015-2020)




5-14


## President approval rating over 5 years (2015-2020)




5-23



5-24




5-34



5-123

## President approval rating over 5 years (2015-2020)




5-annotation+

# 5-txt

The presidential approval rating held steady from 2015 to 2017 at around 42%. In 2017, the president introduced a popular initiative combating child hunger. This led to a quick increase in approval rating, doubling to around 80%. However, the positive sentiment did not last. Due to widespread corruption, the approval rating fell back to around 37% by 2018, and has continued to decline steadily to almost 0% following an impeachment.


# Generated Chart 6

6-0




6-1


### National debt over 20 years




6-2




6-3



6-4




6-12




6-13

### National debt over 20 years




6-14


### National debt over 20 years




6-23



6-24




6-34




6-124

### National debt over 20 years



# 6-annotation+

National debt over 20 years




# 6-txt


Cost-saving budget cuts and sound tax policy caused the national debt to plummet from nearly \$30T to a low of tens of billions by 1992. This low remained for only a few years, as national debt began to rise again starting in 1994. It continued to rise rapidly, at around \$5T per year. By 2000, it had reached its previous high at \$30T. Due to the huge amount of national debt, the government instituted restrictions on international borrowing. As a result, the national debt remained around \$30T from 2000 to 2010.

# Generated Chart 7


7-0




7-1



7-2




7-3




7-4


## Changes in administrative policy caused spikes in immigration



7-12




7-13




7-14

## Changes in administrative policy caused spikes in immigration




7-23




7-24

## Changes in administrative policy caused spikes in immigration




7-34

## Changes in administrative policy caused spikes in immigration




7-234

## Changes in administrative policy caused spikes in immigration



# 7-annotation+

Changes in administrative policy caused spikes in immigration




## 7-txt


Changes in administration policies have had notable effects on the yearly immigration rate. Starting in 1970, the number of immigrants steadily increased from 50K to around 600K. The Refugee Act in 1981 allowed refugees from several wars to enter the country, which led to a sharp increase in 1981, with 2M arrivals in the following year. Over the next two years, immigration dropped quickly, falling to a little less than 1 million by 1985. By 1990, immigration had increased again, reaching a point of 1.5M. A new administration imposed harsher regulations on immigration, resulting in a steady annual decline, reaching about 100K by 2010.

# Generated Chart 8

8-0




8-1




8-2


Number of app users in 2020 less than in 2015



8-3




8-4




8-12

## Number of app users in 2020 less than in 2015




Number of app users ranged from 0 to 500K

8-13




# 8-14




8-23

### Number of app users in 2020 less than in 2015




8-24

Number of app users in 2020 less than in 2015




8-34




8-234

### Number of app users in 2020 less than in 2015



# 8-annotation+

Number of app users in 2020 less than in 2015




Number of app users ranged from 0 to 500K

# 8-txt

When the app was first introduced in 2010, the app had around 350K users. However, it did not live up to marketing promises, which led to a steady decline in users to around 240K over the next two years. To help bolster more engagement, the app received an update with new features, which quickly went viral. This grew the app's user base quickly, reaching a peak of 500K in a single year. However, this update also introduced large issues, which made the app unusable. This led to a sharp drop, as new users abandoned the app as quickly as they had downloaded it. By 2013, the app had only 170K users, which continued to decrease, stagnating around 50K for a couple of years before rounding out 2020 with 30K users.


# Generated Chart 9

9-0




9-1

Sports game attendance (in thousands) over 20 years




9-2


Attendance in 2010 greater than 2009



9-3




9-4



9-12


### Sports game attendance (in thousands) over 20 years

Attendance in 2010 greater than 2009




9-13

Sports game attendance (in thousands) over 20 years




9-14

### Sports game attendance (in thousands) over 20 years




9-23


Attendance in 2010 greater than 2009



9-24




9-34



9-134


### Sports game attendance (in thousands) over 20 years



# 9-annotation+

## Sports game attendance (in thousands) over 20 years

Attendance in 2010 greater than 2009



# 9-txt

A new sports arena opened in 2000 and received a warm welcome from fans, with attendance reaching nearly 20K. However, this declined over the next few years as the local team performed poorly, reaching lows of just 1K by 2009. Alarmed by the bleak sight of empty stadium seats, the team introduced well-priced season ticket deals to entice its fan base back. This led to two back-to-back years of high attendance, around 19K. Once this deal ended and the team did not improve, attendance declined again to around 5K. With some key player hires and a change in coaching staff, the arena boasted 20K attendees again in 2020.