Rough Draft Revisions

Abstract

- Added hook for abstract
- Removed incorrect analysis
- Small grammar changes

Introduction (Section 1)

- Added citations instead of footnotes
- Added section headers for the different parts of the literature review
- Moved the third paragraph about the dataset from the intro to the data and methods section
- Small grammar changes

Data and Methods (Section 2)

- Paragraph 3 in rough draft intro ("giving data and methods vibes") moved to data and methods section 2.1, Data Breakdown and Hypotheses as the first paragraph.
  - Combined previous quotes in section 2.1 of data breakdown with paragraph moved from introduction section
    - Ex. "**We explored two data sets with each observation representing a Taylor Swift song.** The first dataset explores the site Metacritic…" and The other dataset for this study encompasses Taylor Swift's entire discography to date, from her debut album release in 2006 through to her most recent work as of 2022, **excluding singles released separately from an album (e.g., "Only the Young," "Christmas Tree Farm") and non-Taylor-owned albums that have a Taylor-owned alternative (e.g. "Fearless (Taylor's Version)" is included in this dataset instead of "Fearless", which is owned by Swift's previous record label, Big Machine Records)"** were quotes previously in the data and methods section, now included with the paragraph from the introduction to mention observations and exclusion criteria
- Cited correct R packages and functions used
- Embedded hypotheses into structured sentenced rather than listing them out as bullet points
- Since we did not aggregate our data, I removed sentences claiming that we did

- Changed "Figure 1: Table of Summary Statistics" to "Table 1: Table of Summary Statistics"
- Added citations to Spotify Web API, R packages, Tidy Tuesday Github page (in-text and references page)

Results (Section 3)
- Made section flow better (i.e. rather than simply adding figures then describing what they show, I added an introduction to the section, and pulled in information from the figures while discussing the results)
- Removed titles for figures, added to captions instead
- Removed "Analysis one", "Analysis two" and changed to more descriptive titles of our analyses
- Removed over-technical statements in results and explained conclusions in context instead with a quick reference to t-statistic, df, p-value
- Changed figures of scatterplots to range from 0 to 1 with increments of 0.2
- Added prediction equations instead of "Regression line" to annotations in figures
- Removed repetitive sentences that seemed to be reflected in the caption already

Discussion (Section 4)
- Introduced the paragraph by stating the baseline relationships without mentioning significance
- Introduced conjecture as to why we observed what we did in our tests, including support for claims from our literature review
- Added a paragraph detailing the reasons behind the negative correlation between danceability and user scores
- Included new paragraphs discussing why user scores show a significant negative association with danceability while Metacritic scores do not
- Explained the differences between Taylor Swift's fan base and Metacritic audiences, suggesting that critics prioritize lyrical and emotional depth over danceability
- Updated the limitations section to reflect the nuanced relationships between musical qualities and audience/critic perceptions