Patterns from Tableau, looking at the first 7 playlists:

1. Acousticness
   1. Average acousticness ranged from 0.16 to 0.65, which is quite a big range. One playlist in particular stood out but the rest of the data was also fairly varied on this. The range, however, was pretty similar. Every playlist had at least one song with low acousticness and one with very high acousticness.
2. Danceability
   1. Average ranged from 0.46 to 0.59, but the range (max – min) was actually quite varied
   2. Connor’s playlist had a min of .15 and a max of .98, another playlist had a min of .22 and a max of .67.
3. Energy
   1. One playlist had very low average energy but besides that, average energy and the range of energy was very similar. Most of the playlists had at least one song with energy 0.95-1.0
   2. this is probably not a great feature to look at.
4. Instrumentalness
   1. One of the more interesting features to look at as the average is very varied.
   2. Every playlist has a song with almost no instrumentalness. Might be worthwhile to check out if this is some sort of bug in collecting data, or if every playlist had some songs that just don’t have any instruments.
   3. However
5. Liveness
   1. Probably not interesting, has almost no variation
6. Loudness
   1. Loudness is interesting as 6/7 playlists have a very similar average but the min/maxes are different
   2. For 6/7 playlists, the difference between the min and max loudness is between -13 and -15, which is a fairly small range, but the mins and maxes differ a lot. For example, one playlist ranges from -5.5 to -20 loudness, while another ranges from -2 to -13, while another ranges from -0.9 to -16. It is possible that people then have a strong preference to how loud their songs are
7. Speechiness
   1. Min for speechiness was 0 for all playlists. Data could be skewed or messed up
   2. Very large range for max and large-ish range for average speechiness.
8. Tempo
   1. Very boring data, everything is similar. Not much of a range and similar averages
9. Valence
   1. Except for one playlist, the averages and ranges were very similar. Probably doesn’t make a big difference
10. Conclusion/more analysis
    1. Danceability, Instrumentalness, Loudness, Speechiness were the most interesting that seemed to change between playlists
    2. Not sure about Acousticness- it seems like one playlist is very different than the rest. That playlist, number 125766.. etc is the outlier in many of the features. Should try to run data without it, or add more data so it doesn’t skew results.
    3. Liveness, Energy, Tempo, Valence probably don’t make a difference at all
    4. Might want to double check speechiness and instrumentalness as some data is at 0. The median instrumentality of 4 of the playlists is just about 0. Only one of them is significantly high on that. Looking at the median and the 25 percentile data, speechiness isn’t too bad, but instrumentality has some very extreme results.