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## What we're up against

Getting information from a table is like extracting sunlight from a cucumber.

Farquhar and Farquhar, 1891, p55
Perhaps not that bad, but a challenge.

Our discussion follows Ehrenberg (1977, JRSSA) and Wainer (1997, JEBS).

## Types of tables

Wainer lists four types of tables:

- Exploration
- Communication
- Storage
- Decoration

Most displays only do one thing well.

## Exploration

Table of residuals from additive fit in unreplicated two-way design, rows and columns sorted by increasing marginal effects:

| 966 | 878 | 482 | -74 | -2251 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 871 | 790 | 320 | -112 | -1868 |
| 449 | 405 | 793 | 803 | -2449 |
| -2286 | -2072 | -1594 | -617 | 6569 |

What does it tell us about data?
You might not know yet, but you will.

## Communication

From Ehrenberg (1977 The Statistician)
Consumers' $(C)$ and Retailers' $(R)$ ratings of the nutritional and economic values of different foods

| Foods | Nutritional |  | Economic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | C | $R$ | C | $R$ |
| Meat | 62 | 58 | 14 | 11 |
| Milk | 55 | 52 | 44 | 95 |
| Eggs | 49 | 48 | 85 | 61 |
| Cheese | 45 | 52 | 30 | 62 |
| Fresh Veg. | 42 | 24 | 25 | 18 |
| Fish | 33 | 52 | 20 | 10 |
| Chicken | 18 | 13 | 70 | 25 |
| Bread | 5 | 11 | 5 | 21 |

*In decreasing order of Consumers' Nutritional Ratings.

## Archiving

From Wainer (1997 JEBS). Illegibility is practically the point.

| public SCHOOLS | Grade 8-1992 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Graduated College |  | Some Education After High School |  | Graduated High Schoot |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Did Nol Finish High } \\ & \text { Schood } \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 Don't Know |  |
|  | Percentage of Students | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ \text { Proficiency } \end{gathered}$ | Percentage of Students | Average | Percentage of Students | Average Proficiency | Percentage of Students | Proficiency | Percentage of Students | Average Proficiency |
| MATIOM | 40 (1.4) | 279 (1.4) | 18 (0.6) | 270 (1.2) | 25 (0.8) | 256 (1.4) | 8 (0.6) | 248 (1.8) | 9 (0.5) | 251 (1.7) |
| Northeast | 38 (3.1) | 282 (4.2) | 18 (1.1) | 267 (3.0) | 26 (2.2) | 259 (4.2) | 8 (0.9) | 246 (4.2) | 10 (1.2) | 250 (3.3) |
| Southeast | 35 (1.9) | 270 (1.9) | 17 (0.8) | 263 (2.0) | 28 (1.4) | 249 (1.9) | 12 (1.6) | 246 (4.2) | 8 (1.0) | 248 (4.3) |
| Centra! | 42 (2.7) | 283 (2.9) | 20 (1.4) | 273 (1.6) | 26 (1.7) | 264 (2.3) | 4 (0.7) | $\cdots$ ( $\cdots$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7 (0.8) | 258 (3.8) |
| West STATES | 43 (2.9) | 279 (2.6) | 18 (1.2) | 274 (2.6) | 19 (1.5) | 252 (2.9) | 9 (1.1) | 248 (2.4) | 11 (0.9) | 248 (2.9) |
| Alabama | 33 (1.6) | 261 (2.5) | 18 (0.7) | 258 (2.0) | 29 (1.1) | 244 (1.8) | 13 (0.9) | 239 (2.0) | 7 (0.6) | 237 (2.9) |
| Arizona | 36 (1.5) | 277 (1.5) | 22 (1.0) | 270 (1.5) | 21 (0.9, | 256 (1.6) | 10 (0.7) | 245 (2.5) | 12 (0.8) | 248 (2.7) |
| Arkansas | 30 (1.1) | 264 (1.9) | 20 (0.8) | 264 (1.7) | 31 (1.1) | 248 (1.6) | 11 (0.7) | 246 (2.4) | 8 (0.6) | 245 (2.7) |
| Calitorna | 39 (1.8) | 275 (2.0) | 18 (1.0) | 266 (2.1) | 17 (0.9) | 251 (2.1) | 10 (0.9) | 241 (2.2) | 16 (1.1) | 240 (2.9) |
| Colorado | 46 (1.2) | 282 (1.3) | 19 (0.9) | 276 (1.6) | 21 (0.9) | 260 (1.5)> | 6 (0.6) | 250 (2.4) | 7 (0.5) | 252 (2.6) |
| Connecticut | 47 (1.3) | 288 (1.0)> | 16 (0.8) | 272 (1.8) | 22 (0.9) | 260 (1.8) | 6 (0.6) | 245 (3.3) | 9 (0.6) | 251 (2.4) |
| Delaware | 39 (1.2) | 274 (1.3) | 18 (1.0) | 268 (2.3) | 30 (1.0) | 251 (1.7) | 6 (0.5) | 248 (4.0) | 8 (0.9) | 248 (3.4) |
| Dist. Columbia | 32 (1.0) | 244 (1.7) | 17 (0.8) | 240 (1.9) | 29 (0.8) | 224 (1.6) | $9(0.7)$ | 225 (3.2) | 12 (0.6) | 229 (2.2) |
| Fiorida | 39 (1.5) | 268 (1.9) | 19 (0.7) | 266 (1.9) | 24 (1.1) | 251 (1.8) | 8 (0.7) | 244 (2.7) | 10 (0.7) | 244 (3.21) |
| Georgia | 35 (1.7) | 271 (2.1) | 18 (0.7) | 264 (1.7) | 30 (1.2) | 250 (1.3) | 11 (0.8) | 244 (2.2) | 6 (0.6) | 245 (2.6) |
| Hawall | 38 (1.1) | 267 (1.5) | 15 (0.9) < | 268 (1.9) | 25 (1.0) | 246 (1.8) | 6 (0.5) | 242 (3.5) | ${ }^{+6}(0.8)$ | 246 (2.1) $\geqslant$ |
| Idaho | 48 (1.2) | 281 (0.9) | 20 (0.8) | 278 (1.3) | 19 (0.9) | 268 (1.4)> | 7 (0.5) | 254 (2.3) | 6 (0.5) | 254 (2.8) |
| Indiana | 33 (1.5) | 283 (1.5) | $21(0.9)$ | 275 (1.9) | 32 (1.1) | 260 (1.6) | 8 (0.6) | 250 (2.6) | 6 (0.5) | 249 (3.3) |
| lowa | 44 (1.4) | 291 (1.2)> | 21 (0.8) | 285 (1.5) | 25 (1.1) | 273 (1.3) | 4 (0.4) | 262 (2.4) | 5 (0.4) | 266 (2.8) |
| Kentucky | 28 (1.4) | 278 (1.6)" | 19 (0.8) | 267 (1.6) | 32 (0.9) | 254 (1.6) | 15 (0.9) | 246 (1.7) | 6 (0.4) | 242 (2.8) |
| Louisiana | 32 (1.4) | 258 (2.5) | 20 (0.9) | 259 (1.8) | 30 (1.3) | 242 (1.6) | $10(0.7)$ | 237 (2.4) | $7(0.6)$ | 236 (3.7) |
| Maine | 40 (1.5) | 288 (1.4) | 22 (1.0) | 281 (1.5) | 26 (1.1) | 267 (1.1) | 6 (0.5) | 259 (2.7) | 5 (0.5) | 266 (2.6) |
| Maryland | 44 (1.7) | 278 (1.8) | 18 (0.9) | 266 (1.9) | 25 (1.2) | 250 (1.8) | 6 (0.8) | 240 (3.7) | 7 (0.5) | 245 (3.8) |
| Massachusetts | 48 (1.5) | 284 (1.3) | 17 (0.8) | 272 (1.8) | 21 (1.0) | 261 (1.4) | 7 (0.6) | 248 (3.2) | 7 (0.6) | 248 (2.6) |
| Michugan | 38 (1.6) | 277 (2.2) | 23 (0.9) | 271 (2.0) | 26 (0.9) | 257 (1.7) | 6 (0.5) | 249 (2.0) | 7 (0.6) | 248 (3.0) |
| Minnesota Mississippi | $48(1.3)>$ 36 | 290 (1.0) > 25 | 21 (0.9) | 284 (1.8) | 22 (0.9) < | 270 (1.8) $>$ | $3(0.4)$ | 256 (4.2) | 7 (0.6) | 268 (3.0) |
| Mississippi | 36 (1.7) | 254 (1.6) | 16 (0.7) | 256 (2.0) | 29 (1.4) | 239 (1.6) | 13 (0.8) | 234 (1.8) | 7 (0.6) | 231 (2.8) |
| Missourı Nebraska | 36 (1.3) | 280 (1.7) | 22 (0.9) | 275 (1.5) | 29 (1.0) | 264 (1.6) | 8 (0.7) | 254 (2.4) | 6 (0.5) | 252 (2.9) |
| Nebraska | 46 (1.5) | 287 (1.2) | 20 (1.0) | 280 (1.6) | 24 (1.2) | 267 (1.7) | 4 (0.5) | 247 (3.3) | 6 (0.6) | 256 (3.8) |

## Or computer files

\# Number of hawks responding to the "alarm" call \# Variables are year (1999 or 2000), season (courtship, \# nestling, fledgling), distance in meters between the \# alarm call and the nest, number of hawks responding, \# and number of.

| year | season | distance | respond | trials |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 150 | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 225 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 325 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 100 | 6 | 8 |

Should be labeled and annotated.

## Decoration

## May have data, but also draws eye

PARTY PATROL CITATIONS
In fall 2006, the party patrol issued a total of 984 citations. Thefollowing is a breakdown of those citations:
CRIME ..... NUMBER OF CITATIONS
Consumption of alcohol by minor ..... 404
Noisy assembly ..... 377
Noisy assembly and minor consumption ..... 181
Loitering with open bottle ..... 9
Disorderly conduct ..... 4
Obstruction of law enforcement ..... 2
Moving violation ..... 2
Public urination ..... 1
Flee from officer, obstruction and disconduct ..... 1
Public urination and minor consumption ..... 1
Littering and minor consumption ..... 1
Loitering with open bottle and minor consumption ..... 1
TOTAL CITATIONS ..... 984

SOURCE: UMPD
(MN Daily, Jan 19, 2007)

## Back to communication

A display for communication should

- Target an audience
- Have a goal (tell a story)
- Make the story obvious
- Be uncluttered
- Cause no pain


## Rules for Communication

Ehrenberg, Wainer, and many others give rules/advice.
We illustrate with examples from their papers.
Remember, we want to communicate, to tell a story, which could be

- Big picture
- Trends
- Comparisons
- Typical values
- Atypical values


## Ehrenberg's Criteria

## Strong Criterion for Good Table

The patterns and exceptions in a table should be obvious at a glance.

## Weak Criterion for Good Table

The patterns and exceptions in a table should be obvious at a glance once one has been told what they are.

Always meet the weak criterion.

## Before (Ehrenberg)

UK Merchant Vessels in Service

|  | 1962 | 1967 | 1973 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ All vessels | 2,689 | 2,181 | 1,776 |
| Passenger | 242 | 173 | 122 |
| Dry cargo | 1,847 | 1,527 | 1,165 |
| $\quad$ Tankers | 600 | 481 | 489 |
| Thousand deadweight tons |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ All vessels | 26,577 | 27,488 | 46,763 |
| Passenger | 1,467 | 919 | 349 |
| Dry cargo | 13,990 | 14,362 | 20,115 |
| $\quad$ Tankers | 11,120 | 12,167 | 26,299 |

## After (Ehrenberg)

UK Merchant Vessels in Service

| Vessels over 500 tons | 1962 | 1967 | 1973 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Passenger | 240 | 170 | 120 |
| Tankers | 600 | 480 | 490 |
| Dry cargo | 1,800 | 1,500 | 1,200 |
| All vessels | 2,700 | 2,200 | 1,800 |
| Deadweight tons (thousands) |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Passenger | 1,500 | 920 | 350 |
| Tankers | 11,000 | 12,000 | 26,000 |
| Dry cargo | 14,000 | 14,000 | 20,000 |
| All vessels | 26,000 | 27,000 | 47,000 |

## Before (Ehrenberg)

Correlation among TV audiences

|  |  | PrB | ThW | Tod | WoS | GrS | LnU | MoD | Pan | RgS | 24 H |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITV | PrB | 1.000 | 0.106 | 0.065 | 0.505 | 0.474 | 0.092 | 0.473 | 0.168 | 0.309 | 0.124 |
| " | ThW | 0.106 | 1.000 | 0.270 | 0.142 | 0.132 | 0.189 | 0.082 | 0.352 | 0.064 | 0.395 |
| $"$ | Tod | 0.065 | 0.270 | 1.000 | 0.093 | 0.070 | 0.155 | 0.038 | 0.200 | 0.051 | 0.244 |
| " | WoS | 0.505 | 0.147 | 0.093 | 1.000 | 0.622 | 0.079 | 0.581 | 0.187 | 0.297 | 0.140 |
| BBC | GrS | 0.474 | 0.132 | 0.070 | 0.622 | 1.000 | 0.085 | 0.593 | 0.181 | 0.341 | 0.142 |
| " | LnU | 0.092 | 0.189 | 0.155 | 0.079 | 0.085 | 1.000 | 0.049 | 0.197 | 0.097 | 0.266 |
| " | MoD | 0.473 | 0.082 | 0.039 | 0.581 | 0.593 | 0.049 | 1.000 | 0.131 | 0.327 | 0.122 |
| " | Pan | 0.168 | 0.352 | 0.200 | 0.187 | 0.181 | 0.197 | 0.131 | 1.000 | 0.147 | 0.524 |
| " | RgS | 0.309 | 0.064 | 0.051 | 0.296 | 0.341 | 0.097 | 0.326 | 0.147 | 1.000 | 0.121 |
| " | $24 H$ | 0.124 | 0.395 | 0.244 | 0.140 | 0.142 | 0.266 | 0.122 | 0.524 | 0.121 | 1.000 |

## After (Ehrenberg)

Correlation among TV audiences

| Programmes |  | WoS | MoD | GrS | PrB | RgS | 24 H | Pan | ThW | Tod | LnU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| World of Sport | ITV |  | .6 | .6 | .5 | .3 | .1 | .2 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| Match of the Day | BBC | .6 |  | .6 | .5 | .3 | .1 | .1 | .1 | .0 | .0 |
| Grandstand | BBC | .6 | .6 |  | .5 | .3 | .1 | .2 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| Prof. Boxing | ITV | .5 | .5 | .5 |  | .3 | .1 | .2 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| Rugby Special | BBC | .3 | .3 | .3 | .3 |  | .1 | .1 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| 24 Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pancrama | BBC | .1 | .1 | .1 | .1 | .1 |  | .5 | .4 | .2 | .2 |
| This Week | ITV | .1 | .1 | .2 | .2 | .1 | .5 |  | .4 | .2 | .2 |
| Today | ITV | .1 | .0 | .1 | .1 | .1 | .4 | .4 |  | .3 | .2 |
| Line Up | BBC | .1 | .0 | .1 | .1 | .1 | .2 | .2 | .3 |  | .2 |

## Round Drastically

Use two significant figures

- Don't usually understand more than two digits Budget is $\$ 27,329,681$ versus budget is 27 million dollars.
- Rarely justify more than two digits statistically God gave us $1 / \sqrt{n}$, but how big must $n$ be for that third digit?
- We rarely care

Life expectance 67.14 years; . 01 year is about 4 days.

## Ehrenberg original

| Unemployment in Great Britain (thousands) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1966 | 1968 | 1970 | 1973 |
| Total unemployed | 330.9 | 549.4 | 582.2 | 597.9 |
| Males | 259.6 | 460.7 | 495.3 | 499.4 |
| Females | 71.3 | 88.8 | 86.9 | 98.5 |

## Ehrenberg after rounding

| Unemployment in Great Britain (thousands) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1966 | 1968 | 1970 | 1973 |
| Total unemployed | 330 | 550 | 580 | 600 |
| Males | 260 | 460 | 500 | 500 |
| Females | 71 | 89 | 87 | 98 |

## Order Rows/Columns Sensibly

Helps organize and facilitate comparison

- Alphabetical (Alabama first!) almost never correct
- Could be by size
- Could be a natural order, such as time
- By interest (rows or columns to compare should be adjacent)


## Wainer before ordering

Battery Life in Hours

| Battery <br> Brand | Cassette <br> Player | Radio | Flashlight | Portable <br> Computer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant Charge | 5 | 19 | 10 | 3 |
| Electro-Blaster | 10 | 26 | 15 | 4 |
| Never Die | 8 | 28 | 16 | 6 |
| PowerBat | 7 | 24 | 13 | 5 |
| Servo-Cell | 4 | 21 | 12 | 2 |

## Wainer after ordering

Battery Life in Hours

| Battery <br> Brand | Radio | Flashlight | Cassette <br> Player | Portable <br> Computer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never Die | 28 | 16 | 8 | 6 |
| Electro-Blaster | 26 | 15 | 10 | 4 |
| PowerBat | 24 | 13 | 7 | 5 |
| Servo-Cell | 21 | 12 | 4 | 2 |
| Constant Charge | 19 | 10 | 5 | 3 |

## Row/Column Summaries

Give a standard for comparison

- Could be mean/median/total/etc
- Give a visual focus
- Provide a standard of "usual"
- An overall summary can also help
- Can highlight for emphasis


## Wainer with Summaries

Battery Life in Hours

| Battery | Radio | Flash. | Cass. <br> Player | Port. <br> Comp. | Brand <br> Averages |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brand | 28 | 16 | 8 | 6 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| Never Die | 26 | 15 | 10 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |
| Electro-Blaster | 24 | 13 | 7 | 5 | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |
| PowerBat | 21 | 12 | 4 | 2 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Servo-Cell | 19 | 10 | 5 | 3 | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| Constant Charge | 19 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |  |  |  |
| Usage averages | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |

## Down Columns

It's easier to compare numbers down columns.

- Numbers are closer
- Digits line up


## Ehrenberg after Transposition

| Unemployme | in Gre | Britain | ou |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Male | Female | Total |
| 1966 | 260 | 71 | 330 |
| 1968 | 460 | 89 | 550 |
| 1970 | 500 | 87 | 580 |
| 1973 | 500 | 99 | 600 |
| Average | 430 | 86 | 520 |

## Layout/Spacing

- Remove excess lines/boxing
- Use space to emphasize groups/gaps
- Excess space breaks adjacency

What is a stem and leaf plot, but a severely rounded table with meaningful spacing?

## Wainer with Summaries

Battery Life in Hours

| Battery <br> Brand | Radio | Flash. | Cass. <br> Player | Port. <br> Comp. | Brand <br> Averages |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never Die | 28 | 16 | 8 | 6 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| Electro-Blaster | 26 | 15 | 10 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |
| PowerBat | 24 | 13 | 7 | 5 | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |
| Servo-Cell | 21 | 12 | 4 | 2 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Constant Charge | 19 | 10 | 5 | 3 | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| Usage averages | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |

## Wainer's Grades

| Student | Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | 88 |
| B | 65 |
| C | 91 |
| D | 36 |
| E | 72 |
| F | 57 |
| G | 50 |
| H | 85 |
| I | 62 |
| J | 48 |

Student Score

| C | 91 |
| :--- | :--- |
| A | 88 |
| H | 85 |


| E | 72 |
| :--- | :--- |
| B | 65 |
| I | 62 |
| F | 57 |
| G | 50 |
| J | 48 |

D 36

Try to avoid

- Multidimensional tables
- Multivariate tables
- Too many rows or columns

Add

- Labels
- Good titles and explanatory text


## Exceptions

## Point out unusual values



## Good Graphics

## Fundamental Principal of Statistical Graphics

Above all else show the data.

Graphics can be

- powerful
- beautiful
- efficient
- misleading

We must use them well.

## Learn from the best

Ed Tufte is at the top of the pantheon of statistical graphics gods.
We shall listen and obey.
Tufte has three extremely influential books on graphics.
Not everyone agrees with Tufte, but no one can ignore him.

## Everyone else

Other important sources:

- Lee Wilkenson (The Grammar of Graphics)
- Bill Cleveland (The Elements of Graphing Data)
- Howard Wainer (lots of articles)

We follow Tufte, Wainer, and Cabrera and McDougall.

## Tufte's Goals for Graphics

(1) Show the data.
(2) Substance not graphic design or technology.
(3) Do not distort what the data have to say.
(1) Present much data in a small space.
(3) Make large data sets coherent.
(0) Encourage comparison of different pieces of data.
(0) Reveal data at several levels of detail.
(8) Serve a clear purpose (description, exploration, tabulation or decoration)
(0) Be integrated with statistical/verbal descriptions.

## Good Examples from Tufte



## Good Examples from Tufte

NEW YORK CITY'S WEATHER FOR 1980


## Good Examples from Tufte



## Tufte on Technique

- Good format and design

Aesthetics, elegance, and style difficult to prescribe.
Construct, revise, edit, try again

- Words/numbers/graphics together

Data graphics are paragraphs about numbers (Tufte, p 181).
Graphics better for trends, patterns, large data sets.
Tables better for small data sets and quantification.
Graphics and tables must always reinforce message and text.

## Tufte continued

- Accessible friendly graphic

Friendly
Unfriendly
Words spelled out; no myste- Abbreviations forcing a derious abbreviations or codes code from the text

Words left to right
Words vertical or in different directions

Short explanatory text
Cryptic and obtuse graphic
No elaborate colors, shad- Obscure coding requires conings, cross hatching; label on stant reference to legend graph; no legend

## Tufte continued

- Accessible friendly graphic continued

Friendly
Graph attractive, provokes ugly, and filled with curiosity

Colors chosen with color- Red and green used for esdeficient readers in mind sential contrast

Type is clear, precise, mod- type is overpowering, clunky est

Type is upper and lower case Type all capitals, sans serif with serifs

## Tufte continued

- Balance, proportion, scale Wider than tall, say 1.6:1 Use thin lines, no thick
- Narrative quality
- Professional look
- No content-free decoration

Thin lines better


## Content-free decoration



## Other voices

Cabrera \& McDougall have practical advice on

- Aesthetics
- Annotation
- Contrasts
- Comprehension


## Aesthetics

- Use plot region efficiently
- Span plot region
- Leave space in margins for explanatory text in large font (axis label size often too small)
- Must have title and axis labels; other text may add clutter
- Try out color, grey, line types, symbols, etc; revise until it works


## Annotation

- Must have title and axis labels; can have legends, subtitles other text.
- Make axis labels simple but informative; include units.
- Use nice ticks.
- Legends add clutter; use carefully.
- Text annotation adds clutter; use carefully.


## Contrasts

- Color may help, but
- Avoid yellow (projects poorly)
- Blue often works well
- Red/green color blind
- Difficult to get good colormap/greyscale for ranges
- Symbols OK for printing often too small for presentation
- Not too many lines, they can't be distinguished
- Dashed line types ok for horizontal or vertical; less good for curves.
- Avoid thick lines


## Comprehension

- Suit graphics to audience
- Complex graphics require experience
- Don't mislead
- Don't use pie charts
- Connect points in time series; wrap periodic functions
- Be careful with $x / y$ plot scaling and shape


## Tufte's Data Ink

## Definition (Data ink)

Data ink is the "ink" that displays non-redundant data information.

## Definition (Data ink ratio)

Proportion of a graphic's ink devoted to the non-redundant display of data information.
(1) Maximize data ink ratio, within reason
(2) Erase non data ink, within reason
(3) Erase redundant data ink, within reason

## Bad data-ink ratio



## Good data-ink ratio



## Erasable non-data ink



## Improved non-data ink



## Moiré patterns usually bad









## Show data, not frames

MULTIWINDOW PLOT OF PARTICLE PHYSICS MOMENTUM DATA


## WTF



## Avoid puzzles

Try to figure this one out


## Air pollution: small multiples can work



## Do not lie with graphics

The size of the representation of a number should be proportional to the number

The number of information carrying dimensions should not exceed the dimension of the data.

## Backward in time?

This line, representing 18 miles per gallon in 1978, is 0.6 inches long.


This line, representing 27.5 miles per
gallon in 1985, is 5.3 inches long.

## Oil

## IN THE BARREL...

Price per bbl. of
light crude, leaving
Saudi Arabia
on Jan. 1

## Keep data in context

A few more data points add immensely to the account:


## Use consistent graphic design (not like this)



The New York Times / Dec. 19, 1978

## How to Display Data Badly (Wainer)

(1) Show as few data as possible.
(2) Hide what data you do show.
(3) Ignore the visual metaphor.
(9) Only order matters.
(0) Graph data out of context.
( ( Change scales in mid-axis.
(3) Emphasize the trivial, not the important.
(8) Jiggle the baseline.
(9) Austria first.
(10) Label illegibly, incompletely, inaccurately, and ambiguously.

## Summary for Graphs

Many, many ways to do things badly.

- Show the data.
- Do not distort.
- Cause no pain.


## Summary for Tables

- Design for purpose and audience
- Round!
- Organize
- Simplify
- Add summaries
- Good title/labels
- Clean layout/proper spacing

