



The story I am trying to tell is how there is a general decline in barley yield for every type of barley between the years 1931 and 1932. The way I have the data displayed deemphasizes the locations at which the barley was grown, but the information is still present (albeit without the actual values because I created this graphic manually). I wanted to focus on the general trend that the barley collectively demonstrates.

I chose to use a double bar chart to make the difference in barley yield evident. Similarly, this is the reason why I chose red and green as the colors of the bars. Since green has a positive connotation and red has a negative connotation, I used these colors to indicate relatively more and relatively less barley. The names of the barley types are in alphabetical order since it is an intuitive order.

I included the sites at which the barley was sampled by putting colored boxes around the percentage of the total barley yield of each type was found in which location. The colors of the boxes are relatively arbitrary, chosen primarily for their contrast. This turns the graphic into a stacked bar chart with the order of the boxes being location names in alphabetic order from left to right, as indicated by the legend. Admitted, the story this graphic tells would be clearer without the boxes, but in an attempt to add more information into the graphic, I thought I'd try it out. It also allows the viewer to see that in general, the barley yield in each location (except for Morris) saw a general decline in barley yield as well, allowing one to infer that the decline in barley was generally not contingent on the location it was planted.

My placement of the legend on the right-hand side of the graphic is an attempt to draw attention to the fact that the green bars are stretched out further than the red bars, again reiterating the overall decline in barley.

My initial analysis of the data looked something like this where I looked for patterns in the data.





1932

