A. Trak. Tion. (haha attraction)

Chose this because it’s a really cool idea, the axis are clear, and they’re transparent about their methodology. Also, it’s aesthetically pleasing and it reveals information about music, a universally liked idea.

* ABOUT: <http://thevizcorner.wordpress.com/2014/09/05/how-we-did-it/>
  + They set out to measure music popularity based on historical weekly sales rankings since that’s the best indicator of popularity. Interestingly enough, they did this song by song, using weekly music sales rankings published by the Billboard company’s top 100. They used songs only charted after 1954 (dropping a couple thousand incomplete records). Total of 33,560 songs. They converted the sales numbers to percentages of popularity.
    - To determine genre, they Wikipedia searched each song individually – this helped them determine sub-sub genres but also meant that some songs counted as two genres (they split popularity equally among them) 🡪 it’s also shows some discretion /opinionated categorizing
    - For total sales, they used a different data set AND adjusted inflation so that all are adjusted to 2013 US dollars
* LIKE
  + the idea. I like the click thrus. I like the songs which you can listen to at the end. I find it relatively simple and aesthetically pleasing. I like that they are transparent about their methodology
* DON’T LIKE: the visualization basically lies.
  + Band width is misleading: At first I thought we only care about the top data point, the maximum data point peak (and that’s the only data accounted for) (i.e. the money produced by sales measured in billions). Then I realized that for both percent and total sales, the graphic is irrelevant and misleading: compare pop 2000 (6.5B) to pop 2002 (2.6B): visually, one would interpret the graphic to show that 2000 did much more poorly sales wise than 2002; but that’s incorrect.
    - Another point of contention: the stack / order of genres: Visually, there appears to be a hierarchy, as in the top genre makes the most money. But that’s not true. I also considered that maybe each genre had an independent axis, but like I said that can’t be true either, since the data points are visually meaningless and a dip is coordinated with a higher data point than a peak.
    - Another thing: without reading about how they made the chart, I have no idea what percentage means. Is it based on the total sales? Even in the percentage view, the mins and maxs are misleading.