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A diagram of a diagram

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Chosen Question- How To Make The Perfect Eurovision Entry:

A close-up of a diagram

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

A white grid with black text

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Atribute Elicitation

Non subjective Attributes

A white sheet with black text

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Subjective Attributes

A white grid with black text

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

In order for the user to interact with the question “what makes the perfect Eurovision entry”, the user can “build” their own entry based on the acoustics and see how close to the perfect entry they can get?

* Makes the dataset explorable , drag and drop functionality , “mixing deck” would be an interesting concept to follow.
* Can view geographic map to which country or time-period would enjoy the song the most based on subjective attributes
* Audience*:* Eurovision fans, musicians, would want interactive song creator.

Potential Ideas- Initial Ideation:

-Scatterplot (Danceability by Valence).  
-Parallel‑coords of 7 features.  
-Radar overlay of Top‑5 averages.  
-Similarity Gauge (0–100 %).  
-Choropleth Map (colour = country similarity).  
-Timeline Heat‑strip (year by similarity).  
-Nearest‑match Cards with YouTube links?  
-Slider Control Panel (7 features + finalist toggle).  
-Story Button , autoplay best path.  
-Brushing to link scatter, map and timeline.  
-Spark‑line of average points.

Elicitation:

A notebook with colorful lines and text

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

A grid with black text

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Sheet 2:

A notebook with writing on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

A piece of paper with writing on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Context:

This design focuses on giving the user a real-time, audio-feature-based design space to craft their ideal Eurovision song.

Attribute mapping summary:

A table with text on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Reflections and Critiques

Pros:

* Encourages active learning and experimentation.
* Provides direct feedback without overwhelming with views.
* Low cognitive load
* Scatterplot makes clusters and outliers easy to interpret.
* All changes feel responsive, cause and effect is visible.

Cons:

* Lacks geographic or temporal views for context, integrate with another sheet?
* Doesn’t show where/when the song would succeed.
* Limited to two dimensions in the scatterplot.
* No way to compare multiple recipes side-by-side.
* Similarity measure may not be easily interpretable without external explanation.

Zoom:

* The scatterplot allows zooming into dense regions to inspect how top-ranking songs are distributed.
* Potential to add a tooltip history or ghost trails to show how similarity improves with each adjustment.
* Could integrate clustering or trend lines to show natural groupings.

Sheet 3

A notebook with writing on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Context:

Based on sheet 2, the user mixes the song combination on audio features, allowing users to answer: "Where in Europe (country-wise) and when in time (year-wise) would my song be most successful based on historical data?" Connecting audio similarity to country and year.

Attribute Mapping Summary:

A white and black grid with black text

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Critiques and Reflections

**Pros**

* Connects subjective audio features to entry success by year/country.
* Brings depth to the similarity metric by connecting it to regional/cultural preferences.
* Timeline is intuitive for seeing changes in musical trends, encouraging research.
* Encourages comparative exploration e.g. countries vs. each other; potential for year by year filter
* Makes use of more dataset fields without overwhelming the user.

**Cons**

* Choropleth might oversimplify by averaging diverse entries.
* Some countries have fewer entries, making similarity less reliable.
* May be visually overwhelming on small screens, less exportability or pop ups.
* Requires tooltips to be interpretable.

**Zoom**

* Timeline brushing acts as a temporal zoom, for isolating eras of music.
* Map click acts as geographic zoom; lets users inspect how a song compares to past entries from a specific country.
* Could include magnifier effect on the timeline for finer year selection.
* Tooltips on both map and timeline allow users to uncover layered info without cluttering the screen.

A notebook with writing on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.Sheet 4-

A notebook with writing on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

**Context / Intent**

Integration of sheet 2 and 3, attempting to merge scatterplot, slider panel, radar chart, similarity gauge, timeline, and choropleth map in a coordinated view. Connecting perfect song with the geographic and time period simultaneously.

Attribute Mapping Summary:

A table with text on it

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

Critiques and Reflections;

**Pros**

* Fully interactive: every view is both reactive and a filter.
* Visual balance between overview and detail.
* Highest potential for discovery, reflection, and justification.

**Cons**

* Highest implementation complexity; requires strong coordination logic, might be too high on cognitive load or require wireframing
* Potential information overload on small screens.
* Requires a good introductory explanation or onboarding tooltips.
* Can be cognitively intense

**Zoom**

* Timeline brushing lets users focus on specific Eurovision eras.
* Choropleth interaction reveals regional differences in song preference.
* Scatterplot zoom (via brush or scroll) reveals structure within the audio feature space.
* Dynamic recalculation of similarity ensures views always reflect user intent.
* Could support comparison between user’s song and selected historical entries for side-by-side radar overlays.

Sheet 5: TBC after meeting