Here is my Literature/Media rubric that I designed.

Total Points: 100
3 Main Facets for Quality: I. Breadth, II. Depth, III. Consistency
1 Facet for Valence: Grimness

Conglomerate Facets:
  I.   Breadth and Depth combine to make the Ideas superfactor
  II.   Breadth and Consistency combine to make the Enjoyability superfactor
  III. Depth and Consistency combine to make the Refinement superfactor
  IV.   Depth and Grimness combine to make the Conceptual Maturity superfactor

8 Octants:
B+ D+ C+ = Masterpiece
B+ D+ C- = Experimental Work
B+ D- C+ = Blockbuster/Bestseller
B+ D- C- = Amateur Work
B- D+ C+ = Classic
B- D+ C- = Esoterica
B- D- C+ = Comfort Media
B- D- C- = Factory-produced slop

Examples of Works in each octant:
Masterpiece (B+ D+ C+): Dream of Red Chambers
Experimental Work (B+ D+ C-): House of Leaves
Blockbuster/Bestseller (B+ D- C+): Jurassic Park
Amateur Work (B+ D- C-): Tomorrowland
Classic (B- D+ C+): Of Mice and Men
Esoterica (B- D+ C-): Angel Egg (1985)

Comfort Media (B- D- C+): New Girl (2011)
Slop (B- D- C-): Emoji Movie

Shorthand notation of each Octant in this literature/media typology:
Masterpiece: BDC
Experimental Work: BD
Bestseller: BC
Classic: DC
Amateur Work: B
Esoterica: D
Comfort Media: C
Slop: *

Alternate shorthand notation uses two different letters to represent each pole on each dimension:
Breadth: Broad (B) vs. Narrow (N)
Depth: Deep (D) vs. Shallow (S)
Consistency: Consistent (C) vs. Messy (M)

Hence, the eight distinct octants can be also notated as:
Masterpiece: BDC
Experimental Work: BDM
Bestseller: BSC
Amateur Work: BSM
Classic: NDC
Esoterica: NDM
Comfort Media: NSC
Slop: NSM

If we're including the affective valence/happiness dimension, which won't be included in the overall rubric/scoring system itself because, unlike Breadth, Depth, and Consistency, it doesn't objectively affect

quality of the media, the two poles for this fourth valence dimension could be represented by these shorthands:
Happiness: Happy (H) vs. Grim (G)
Then, simply append -H or -G with a dash to the end of the "quality octant" the work/media/literature sits in to represent this fourth, purely valence, dimension.

For instance, "New Girl" (2011) is the quintessential NSC-H (happy Comfort Media). Angel's Egg or Erik Satie's Vexations on the other hand both fall solidly into NDM-G (grim Esoterica).

If we were to come up with an archetypal example for each sedecimant (16-ant) based on these four dimensions (3 of them describing objective quality, the 4th describing valence), we have:

BDC-H (Happy Masterpiece): The Truman Show
BDC-G (Grim Masterpiece): Dream of Red Chambers

BDM-H (Happy Experimental Work): Lord of the Rings
BDM-G (Grim Experimental Work): Donnie Darko

BSC-H (Happy Bestseller/Spectacle): Frozen
BSC-G (Grim Bestseller/Thriller): Hunger Games

BSM-H (Happy Amateur Work): Tomorrowland
BSM-G (Grim Amateur Work): Countdown (2019)

NDC-H (Happy Classic): Pride and Prejudice
NDC-G (Grim Classic): The Man Who Knew Infinity and Wuthering Heights

NDM-H (Happy Esoterica): extremely rare and elusive

NDM-G (Grim Esoterica): Angel's Egg, My Dinner with Andre, or Erik Satie's Vexations

NSC-H (Happy Comfort Media): New Girl (2011)
NSC-G (Grim Comfort Media): The Fault in Our Stars and Class of '09

NSM-H (Happy Slop): Emoji Movie
NSM-G (Grim Slop): The Room

Facet I: Breadth (30 points total)

Subfacet 1-A: Premise (10 points)
Negative Traits: Flawed or hackneyed premise/central concepts, or no rich theoretical premise at all
Positive Traits: Inventive/riveting concepts and brainstorming

Subfacet 1-B: Worldbuilding (10 points)
Negative Traits: Unremarkable setting/exposition, lack of diversity in cast
Positive Traits: Rich and well-defined worldbuilding and setting

Subfacet 1-C: Plot (10 points)
Negative Traits: Predictable events, linear plot
Positive Traits: Original plot devices and twists, rich arcs, branching plot

Facet II: Depth (40 points total)

Subfacet II-A: Characters (10 points total)

Negative Traits: 1-dimensional caricatures, cardboard-thin tropes, hackneyed character dynamics without adding anything new (e.g. black cat and golden retriever couple)
Positive Traits: characters are well distinguished from each other and given well-defined identities via voice/internal monologues, they have complex arcs and develop nontrivially throughout the story, their motivations, personalities, and neuroses are nuanced

Note: Character sub-rubric should be divided into 3 tertiary-level subfacets: (1) Neuroses (4 points), (2) Relationships (3 points), (3) Obfuscation (3 points), for a total of 10 points

Subfacet II-B: Themes (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Paper thin or shoehorned themes, shallow tropes
Positive Traits: Philosophical depth, multilayered and full of gray areas, enhances the audience's worldview

Subfacet II-C: Subtlety (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Too much concrete narration, obviously forced symbolism or metaphors or none at all.
Positive Traits: Follows the "show don't tell" axiom of writing, layered and effective symbolism/metaphors

Subfacet II-D: Social Commentary (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Self-contained and lacks broader political or cultural commentary, or the points made aren't original or are shoehorned in
Positive Traits: Comments on or makes a thoughtful point about the current or past state of the world (in social or political terms)

Facet III: Consistency (30 points total)

Subfacet III-A: Logic (10 points total)

Negative Traits: plotholes, weak suspension of disbelief, continuity errors
Positive Traits: does well at suspending disbelief, characters' actions and events/cause and effect chain makes sense

Subfacet III-B: Chekhov's Gun (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Irrelevant filler padding, arcs that are left unresolved
Positive Traits: Ties up loose ends, no irrelevant/one-time characters or plot points

Subfacet III-C: Pacing (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Plot moves either too fast or too slow, or inconsistent speed
Positive Traits: Well structured narrative, good demarcation into character arcs/timeline of narrative makes sense.

Subfacet-III-D: Execution (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Low-budget, full of/easily noticeable errors/bugs/glitches, jarring to watch
Positive Traits: High quality, high effort, smooth, decently polished

----
Note on Breadth vs. Depth:

In my typology rubric, Breadth is essentially a measure of originality and variety the work offers outwardly, while Depth is a measure of intellectual engagement needed to properly appreciate the work. A work can very much be high Breadth but low Depth - imaginative/inventive premises that lean on the hypothetical or unexplored, rich and well developed worldbuilding and character cast (very detailed and immersive), a variety of plot and character arcs, but ultimately lacking thoughtful development of the characters

themselves or having only paper-thin themes. (e.g. Harry Potter, The Fifth Element, Da Vinci Code, Inside Out). On the other hand, a work can be low Breadth but high Depth - they could be retellings of things that exist or have already happened (a big category is documentaries like The Man who Knew Infinity), and/or have focused scope and a remarkably simple plotline or worldbuilding only containing a few characters (e.g. like Nightcrawler or Of Mice and Men), but require a good amount of intellectual or philosophical reflection to truly appreciate.

In general, in this rubric, Breadth is about the variety and novelty of ideas that are brought to the table, and Depth is about how intellectually and thoughtfully these ideas are explored.

Another notion that I would like to expound on is the notion of Conceptual Maturity (CM), which can range from age 3 to age 21, inclusive, in terms of minimum recommended age to read or consume the media in question. This is much different, and can operate quasi-independently, of conventional Content Maturity (what MPAA uses). Unlike Content Maturity though (which does not relate to any of the 4 dimensions - Breadth, Depth, Consistency, and Happiness in this typology whatsoever), Conceptual Maturity primarily is a function of high Depth and low Happiness (specifically when combined). In my typology notation, this is particularly "xDx-G" (which subsumes BDC-G, BDM-G, NDC-G, and especially NDM-G).

The argument for the espousal of Conceptual Maturity rather than Content Maturity as a framework is that
(1) it humanizes art/media as they deserve, since Conceptual Maturity directly relates to the Depth and Grimness polar ends (which is what

some media try to portray in an artistic way - social commentary of the corrupt and desolate world we live in), while Content Maturity is arbitrary and operates wholly independently of art/media quality and valence.

(2) It can be argued that sometimes, Conceptual Maturity is what makes a piece of literature or media "adult" rather than Content Maturity, at least if we think more long term. Sex, drugs, or concrete violence are all much easier for young people to understand/process than layered satire, political/social commentary, weighty philosophical themes, or character/emotional nuance (especially if paired with neurosis or mental illness). The harm in someone with an underdeveloped cerebral cortex (which implies immature and less abstract/farsighted thinking) either misconstruing the intentions of the work (for example, by kinning or identifying with a protagonist or character that's not meant to be idolized due to the Halo Effect - examples: Lou Bloom or Patrick Bateman) or developing distorted and unhealthy worldviews due to not understanding the notion of unreliable narrators or layered satire/political commentary far outweighs the harm in a teen hearing some dirty joke or a use of the F-word.

To give an example of this framework in action:
Nightcrawler (2014) arguably has much higher conceptual maturity than content maturity, and is rated R despite not having sex scenes or overt violence at all. Indeed, I would categorize Nightcrawler as NDC-G (Grim Classic). The same goes for Wuthering Heights, as yet another NDC-G/BDC-G.
On the other hand, New Girl (2011), the epitome of the NSC-H (Happy Comfort Media) sedecimant, has much lower conceptual maturity than content maturity. The only reason it's rated TV-14 is because of occasional innuendos.

Note that again, only the three original dimensions, Breadth, Depth, and Consistency, objectively affect the quality of the media/literature.

Perhaps the scoring system could be made slightly different to align with how the general public or IMDb usually rates films and TV. Instead of a composite score out of 100 for all 3 quality facets (although this will still be used to determine overall broad quality), the score could just be simply the percentage the dimension that the work scores the highest on among all 3 quality dimensions (breadth, depth, consistency). To distinguish this new metric from the composite score, we will call this the "signature score" of the work.

Example (applied to Donnie Darko):

Movie Review #1 (Donnie Darko)

1. Breadth - 8/10
Although this movie uses several common plot devices/concepts, such as time travel, doomed love, and multiverses, it blends them together in an imaginative and compelling way. A riveting mix of horror and sci-fi, and plot twists such as Gretchen's death and the dance team's final flight are well thought out especially near the climax and ending (the last few hours before the tangent universe ends). Worldbuilding isn't as rich as Lord of the Rings, but key lore/story elements (such as Grandma Death's book) are unique and well-defined for the purpose of this story (e.g. chapter excerpts of her book are actually written out)

2. Depth - 10/10
This is the facet where this movie stands out. Philosophical themes such as free will vs. determinism are deeply woven into the central plot of the movie - Donnie Darko paradoxically has a choice to save

the rest of the world from the tangent universe, yet the tangent universe itself is deterministic. A scathing but layered social commentary/critique particularly about the influence of authority figures and the hypocrisy of organized religion, particularly as a copout/way some of the characters cope with fear. Biblical allusions, such as Jim Cunningham representing Satan and Donnie Darko representing Jesus' necessary death (but ironically in the alternate, normal universe, Donnie Darko gets forgotten), are also present. Quite the epitome of "show don't tell" subtlety. This movie also intertwines sci-fi/philosophical elements with realistic neuroses or mental illnesses which is illustrated through Donnie Darko's therapy visits. Due to this, this movie also is very open to interpretation (a hallmark of depth) - one could choose to interpret the whole timeline as Donnie's schizophrenic thoughts as well.

3. Consistency - 4/10
Does decently in Chekhov's Gun (new leads tend to all be all related back to the main plot in some way), particularly the initially seemingly irrelevant subplot of Donnie's sister's dance team. However, pacing is the main weakness of this movie - particularly, the romance subplot between Donnie and Gretchen seems forced/rushed in some way and could be stretched out/defined more clearly. Some parts of the movie's logic are not clear at first (why did the jet engine itself accidentally open a wormhole into a tangent dimension?), a high level of suspension of disbelief is required.

4. Valence/Grimness - 8/10
has a happy ending (or maybe not depending on your interpretation, because the world is reduced to a mundane average once again with its flaws, such as Cunningham's presence and influence, intact), but inherently is dark and disturbing in its themes and Donnie Darko's core character.

Octant - BDM (broad, deep, messy) otherwise known as Experimental Work.
Subtype - BDM-G (broad, deep, messy, grim)

Remark: this movie is pretty much the complete opposite of the sitcom New Girl (2011) on these 4 dimensions, which is instead NSC-H (narrow, shallow, consistent, happy).

Also, a good litmus test for evaluating how well developed or well written characters are is to put them into a boilerplate scenario like a zombie apocalypse and see if their interactions and personalities can still make the story interesting. It basically is squeezing out all the Breadth (especially any original premise or world building) from the story to isolate and stress test the facet of Depth.

Also, this rubric shows how even if the premise/plot/concepts aren't anything new, even if the work is derivative/unoriginal in that area (low Breadth), it can still be a high quality/revered work due to high Depth or high Consistency.

Refinement of this typology system (3 factor model -> 4 factor model):

Previously, the typology had Breadth as a singular axis and three total quality axes: Breadth, Depth, and Consistency. Now, we should split Breadth up into two independent dimensions: (1) Conceptual Breadth (subsumes the subfacet of Premise) and (2) Physical Breadth (subsumes subfacets Worldbuilding and Plot Complexity).

Conceptual Breadth itself should have the following subfacets (it could also be named Inventiveness):

- Originality

Positive Traits: Compelling/original/unique concepts/ideas that haven't been explored or done before. Could also combine multiple previous eclectic ideas in original ways (the whole is larger than the sum of its parts).

Negative Traits: Derivative concepts (for instance, Lycoris Recoil is largely derivative of 1984), story retellings without new concepts or elements, hackneyed or tropey premise/ideas. One-trick ponies/gimmicks that don't really offer anything else.

- Theoretical Richness

Positive Traits: "what-if scenarios", hypothetical, imaginative, extrapolates from reality rather than staying anchored in it.

Negative Traits: Stays mostly grounded in existing "real" ideas and concepts rather than hypotheticals.

Physical Breadth has the same two subfacets (Worldbuilding and Plot Complexity/Unpredictability) as discussed earlier in this document. It could also be named "Scope" or "Unpredictability". Together, Scope/Unpredictability (Physical) and Inventiveness (Conceptual) make the conglomerate facet of Breadth.

We will notate the Conceptual Breadth dichotomy as Inventive (I, high scorers) vs. Quotidian (Q, low scorers). Similarly, the Physical Breadth dichotomy will be notated as Rich (R, high scorers) vs. Undeveloped (U, low scorers). Depth (Deep (D) vs Shallow (S)) and Consistency (Consistent (C) vs Messy (M)) will remain the same.

This is to account for literature/media that are neutral in Breadth as a whole depending on the aspect surveyed - For instance movies like Meshes of the Afternoon and Angel's Egg could have very inventive

premises/concepts but very simple plots or minimal worldbuilding (Inventive but Undeveloped - IUxx). On the other hand, books like Dream of Red Chambers don't do much with strictly conceptual invention (other than an imaginative tie-in to mythology at the beginning), but are sprawling in its plot and worldbuilding (over 400 characters, many arcs that intricately tie together, branching storytelling) (Quotidian but Rich - QRxx)

Now, there are 4 quality factors/dimensions: Conceptual Breadth (Inventive vs. Quotidian), Physical Breadth (Rich vs. Undeveloped), Depth (Deep vs. Shallow), and Consistency (Consistent vs. Messy) and 1 valence dimension (Happy vs. Grim) which makes this rubric/typology now have 16 quality sedecimant categories (rather than just the original 8 octants), with 2 subtypes based on valence per sedecimant (making for 32 types of media in total), which will be notated -H or -G as previously described.

Here are all 16 quality sedecimants, their names/summaries, and archetypal examples for each:

Masterpiece/Classic family:
IRDC (Inventive, Rich, Deep, Consistent) - "Masterwork"
Example: Lord of the Rings
IUDC (Inventive, Undeveloped, Deep, Consistent) - "Journey"
Example: Wuthering Heights
QRDC (Quotidian, Rich, Deep, Consistent) - "Saga"
Example: Dream of Red Chambers
QUDC (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Deep, Consistent) - "Classic"
Example: Of Mice and Men

Experimental/Esoterica family:
IRDM (Inventive, Rich, Deep, Messy) - "Curiosity"

Example: Donnie Darko
IUDM (Inventive, Undeveloped, Deep, Messy) - "Esoterica"
Example: Coherence
QRDM (Quotidian, Rich, Deep, Messy) - "Morass"
Example: As I Lay Dying
QUDM (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Deep, Messy) - "Reflection"
Example: My Dinner with Andre

Bestseller/Comfort Media family:
IRSC (Inventive, Rich, Shallow, Consistent) - "Spectacle"
Example: The Da Vinci Code
IUSC (Inventive, Undeveloped, Shallow, Consistent) - "Excursion"
Example: Megamind
QRSC (Quotidian, Rich, Shallow, Consistent) - "Community"
Example: Lucky Star
QUSC (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Shallow, Consistent) - "Relax"
Example: New Girl

Amateur/Slop family:
IRSM (Inventive, Rich, Shallow, Messy) - "Anticipation"
Example: The Amazing World of Gumball
IUSM (Inventive, Undeveloped, Shallow, Messy) - "Shower Thought"
Example: Sausage Party
QRSM (Quotidian, Rich, Shallow, Messy) - "Fraternity"
Example: Lycoris Recoil
QUSM (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Shallow, Messy) - "Slop"
Example: Emoji Movie

Refined/complete 4-factor rubric:

Dimension I: Creativity (20 points)
Subfacet I-A: Ingenuity (10 points)

Positive Traits: Compelling/original/unique concepts/ideas that haven't been explored or done before. Could also combine multiple previous eclectic ideas in original ways (the whole is larger than the sum of its parts).

Negative Traits: Derivative concepts (for instance, Lycoris Recoil is largely derivative of 1984), story retellings without new concepts or elements, hackneyed or tropey premise/ideas. One-trick ponies/gimmicks that don't really offer anything else.

Subfacet I-B: Theoretical Richness

Positive Traits: "what-if scenarios", hypothetical, imaginative, extrapolates from reality rather than staying anchored in it.

Negative Traits: Stays mostly grounded in existing "real" ideas and concepts rather than hypotheticals.

Positive Pole: Inventive (I)
Negative Pole: Quotidian (Q)

Dimension II: Variety (20 points)
Subfacet II-A: Worldbuilding (10 points)
Negative Traits: Unremarkable setting/exposition, lack of diversity in cast
Positive Traits: Rich, immersive and well-defined worldbuilding and setting

Subfacet II-B: Plot Complexity (10 points)
Negative Traits: Predictable events, linear, bland, or repetitive plot
Positive Traits: Original plot devices and twists, rich and intricate arcs, branching plot

Positive Pole: Rich (R)
Negative Pole: Focused (U)

Dimension III: Depth (40 points)

Subfacet III-A: Character Complexity (15 points) (will expounded on in a tertiary level rubric)

Negative Traits: 1-dimensional caricatures, cardboard-thin tropes, hackneyed character dynamics without adding anything new (e.g. black cat and golden retriever couple)

Positive Traits: characters are well distinguished from each other and given well-defined identities via voice/internal monologues, they have complex arcs and develop nontrivially throughout the story, their motivations, personalities, psychology, and neuroses are nuanced. They also have complex relationships with other characters in the story and are not just shallow "hero/villain" archetypes.

Subfacet III-B: Commentary (15 points) - The heavy weighting and definition of this facet is based on the philosophical thesis "all art is political".

Negative Traits: Paper-thin themes, generic or black and white view on morality (e.g. good vs. evil), either does not attempt to comment on societal or human condition or commentary is overt/shoehorned.

Positive Traits: Philosophically reflective, layered themes that are open to interpretation, embraces gray areas particularly in knowledge and ethics, makes profound points about humanity, history, society, culture, or political ideologies, alludes to religion or other cultural movements.

Subfacet III-C: Subtlety (10 points)

Negative Traits: Too much concrete narration, obviously forced symbolism or metaphors or none at all. Elements/devices in the story mostly serve to advance the plot rather than for artistic intent.

Positive Traits: Follows the "show don't tell" axiom of writing, has layered and effective symbolism/metaphors.

Positive Pole: Deep (D)
Negative Pole: Shallow (S)

Dimension IV: Consistency (20 points)

Subfacet IV-A: Internal Logic (5 points total)
Negative Traits: plotholes, weak suspension of disbelief, continuity errors
Positive Traits: does well at suspending disbelief, characters' actions and events/cause and effect chain makes sense

Subfacet IV-B: Chekhov's Gun (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Irrelevant filler padding, arcs that are left unresolved
Positive Traits: Ties up loose ends, no irrelevant/one-time characters or plot points

Subfacet IV-C: Pacing (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Plot moves either too fast or too slow, or inconsistent speed
Positive Traits: Well structured narrative, good demarcation into character arcs/timeline of narrative makes sense.

Subfacet IV-D: Execution Quality (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Low-budget, full of/easily noticeable errors/bugs/glitches, jarring to watch
Positive Traits: High quality, high effort, smooth, decently polished

Positive Pole: Consistent (C)
Negative Pole: Messy (M)

Tertiary-level rubric for the Character Complexity subfacet of Depth (15 points total):

For each major character, they should be scored on the Individual Character rubric (10 points total) (Subfacet III-A-I):

Subfacet III-A-I-1: Neuroses (4 points total) - The inclusion of this subfacet is based on the Enneagram theoretical framework.

Negative Traits: Caricatures that are myopic stereotypes rather than archetypes/blueprints. Their motivations are simple and without subtlety, e.g. "to get the girl" or "to be the evil villain". The character is dependent on the plot.

Positive Traits: Well-defined and nuanced motivations and beliefs for either taking certain actions or espousing certain belief systems. The character feels human, and their mental/emotional struggles are layered and authentic rather than shallow or artificial. Characters are complex rather than portrayed as just "good or evil". The plot is dependent on the character.

Negative Pole: Hackneyed (H)

Positive Pole: Inspired (I)

Subfacet III-A-I-2: Individuation (3 points total):

Negative Traits: A redundant or shallow/low-fidelity personality that can be easily replaced by another character. Speaks and thinks the same as other characters in the story.

Positive Traits: A distinguishing voice, whether it be style of speech/patterns of thought, or internal monologue. A unique personality with well-defined strengths, weaknesses, behaviors, and character traits. Their physical design and involvement in the plot is not an accidental property.

Negative Pole: Redundant (R)

Positive Pole: Unique (U)

Subfacet III-A-I-3: Development (3 points total):
Negative Traits: A character that remains static/flat throughout the story, or a character whose change in personality only comes from events in the plot rather than through their own internal reflections or decision making.
Positive Traits: A character who is constantly reflecting or thinking about their motivations or beliefs, and/or whose beliefs change due to their own volition or underlying neuroses. The setting and plot points serve as the environment that shapes the character rather than some drug or medicine that forces a personality change.
Negative Pole: Static (S)
Positive Pole: Dynamic (D)

Then, their scores should be averaged (out of 10) for each character, but with the average weighted on how much each character is involved in the story.

For the set of characters in general, they should be scored on the Character Interactions rubric (5 points total) (Subfacet III-A-II)
Positive Traits: The characters' relationships feel organic, authentic, and have complexity, nuance, and developing variance. Romantic relationships that are more based on the compatibility (and incompatibility) between the characters' beliefs and motivations than their outward behaviors. Dialogue between characters is natural and cohesive, and reflects their personalities either clashing or harmonizing.
Negative Traits: Not thematically cohesive/the interaction feels shoehorned in to advance the plot. Relationships are overdone cliches such as the Golden Retriever x Black Cat couple trope. Each character fulfills an archetypal/generic role (e.g. "the bubbly manic

pixie dream girl", "the comic relief") within the cast. Dialogue between characters is inane or exaggerated.

Positive Pole: Organic (O)
Negative Pole: Artificial (A)

NOTE: in stories with only one main character, an interaction between a character with another character doesn't have to be between physically distinct characters, it can be between the different personas of the sole character.
In total, this makes Character Complexity worth 4+3+3+5 = 10+5 = 15 points.

Additionally, what might the analogy of "Duo types" (from the AB5C version of the Big 5) look like for this similar Big 5-esque framework? Use the original dichotomy letters for the trait codes.

Creativity: Inventive/Quotidian

Scope: Rich/Undeveloped

Depth: Deep/Shallow

Consistency: Consistent/Messy

Valence: Happy/Grim

Including valence there would actually be 40 duo types (5 choose 2 ways to select two dimensions; and 2^2 ways to select the poles for those two dimensions)

Also, Creativity, Variety, Depth, and Consistency cutoffs (for the dichotomy codings) should each be higher than 50% of the total

possible points. My suggestions for the cutoffs are Creativity: 13+/20, Variety: 12+/20, Depth: 27+/40, and Consistency: 15+/20.

QUDC examples: of mice and men, the old man and the sea, the man who knew infinity, the pianist, whiplash, Zodiac, Your Lie In April. For some reason, QUDC examples are much easier to name and much more common than QUDM examples. In general, QUDM ("Reflection") is probably the rarest sedecimant on my typology. All sedecimants one Hamming distance away from QUDM, which includes QUDC, QUSM, QRDM, and IUDM, are much more common than true QUDM works, at least when it comes to released works.