

Horror Sequels Ranked

In an effort to collect an all-encompassing collection of sequels, I pulled together 158 horror films and Jeremy broke down the data for each. Below you will find the MFFM breakdown..

Data collected:

- Rotten Tomatoes Critic Score
- Rotten Tomatoes Audience Score
- IMDB User Score
- Amazon Consumer Ratings
- All Scores Averaged (RT Critic/Audience), Amazon, IMDB)
- Audience Scores Averaged (IMDB, Amazon and Rotten Tomatoes)
- Return on Investment (ROI) for each film (Box Office Mojo and IMDb)

The following data was collected on September 15, 2015 by Mark Hofmeyer for use on Movies, Films & Flix blog (www.moviesfilmsandflix.com). The subsequent sources were used to compile this data:

- Rotten Tomatoes (Critics, RT Audience Score) - <http://www.rottentomatoes.com/>
- Internet Movie Database (IMDb User Ratings) - <http://www.imdb.com/>
- Amazon (Amazon Consumer Reviews) - <http://www.amazon.com/>
- Box-Office Mojo (Box Office data) - <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/>
- Internet Movie Database (IMDb Box Office data) <http://www.imdb.com/>

Explaining the Movies, Flix, and Film Metric (MFFM Version 1.0).

This post introduces version 1.0 of the Movies, Films & Flix compound Metric (MFFM). Our first use of the MFFM is in Mark's recent post on the top horror movie franchises. Many thanks to him for generating the idea and for compiling all the data used to test the MFFM.

The MFF crew developed the MFFM composite metric as a way to consolidate available information on movie performance (e.g., movie critics' review scores, box office returns) into a single, easy-to-understand score. The score can be used to objectively compare movies or (as in Mark's post) movie franchises. For an example, think ESPN's [Player Efficiency Rating](#) (PER) developed by the great John Hollinger. Like PER, it takes a couple of important but incomplete data points and uses them to generate a more complete picture of a movie's quality.

Version 1.0 of the MFFM incorporates the following performance data: IMDB ratings, Rotten Tomatoes (RT) Critic's Ratings, RT User Ratings, an adjusted version of Amazon user reviews, and a MFF-developed rating to describe return-on-investment (profits less budget). To get the MFFM for a given movie, we sum the individual scores and divide by the number of non-null values (i.e., missing scores don't negatively affect the

score). By aggregating MFFM scores for a group of movies, we can get an MFFM value for an entire movie franchise (or for a given director, actor, year, etc.).

Here are a couple quick notes on each of the data points incorporated into the MFFM:

- IMDB Ratings - Taken as they come from the website. Valuable because there is an IMDB score for every movie in our list, no matter how obscure. A fault is that ratings for some movies can be based on a small number of votes, making them unreliable.
- RT Critic's Ratings - The gold standard for movie ratings but it does have faults. First, it doesn't incorporate fan ratings. MFF is defined by our love for how fans feel about movies so we see it as an insufficient measure for movie quality. Second, there isn't an RT Critic's Rating for all movies. For example, in our main "horror franchise" dataset (all movies that are part of a horror franchise with greater than 4 movies), 102 of the 248 movies don't have an RT Critic's Rating.
- RT User Ratings - User generated rating for movies from the RT website. Like IMDB, a fault is that ratings for some movies can be based on a small number of votes, making them unreliable.
- Adjusted Amazon Rating - This is the number of reviewers that gave the movie "five stars." Like IMDB and RT User Ratings, there is an Amazon Rating for every movie, no matter how obscure. Like IMDB and RT User Ratings, the rating can be based on only a few votes, making them unreliable. More so than IMDB and RT User Ratings, fanboys (using the term non-pejoratively, relax) and drive-by-movie-raters (using the term pejoratively, get your pitchfork) can inflate the rating of movies that are (honestly and reasonably) terrible. *Halloween IV* and *V* have Amazon ratings of 96 and 100, respectively. *Shawshank Redemption* has a 91. To adjust for this travesty, we multiply each movie's rating by 0.5. This reduces the dispersion and the impact of the Amazon Rating on the MFFM.
- ROI - MFF takes return-on-investment seriously. It's where the rubber hits the road (and where [crypts in New Orleans](#) are bought). We calculate a ROI score for each movie using a couple steps. First, we rank all movies by their ROI coefficient. We get a ROI coefficient for each movie by subtracting a movie's budget from its profit and then dividing by the budget (all values adjusted for inflation). Then, we divide a movie's ROI rank by the total number of movies in the dataset (158 in the case of the horror franchise data set) and multiply by 100. This gives us a value that is roughly equivalent to the 1--100 scale used in the other ratings systems. For movies without budget or profit information available online, we assume a small profit (roughly similar to the average profit for all movies in the data set).

Enjoy future posts as we try to wring maximum value from all the work that went into building our data set and developing the MFFM....and beat you over the head with our claims of objective critical superiority.

Jeremy