Figure 2: “Movies Critics Loved, But Audiences Really Didn’t”

1. Question 1: Analysis  
   1. The goal of the graphic

The goal the visualisation is to show the movies that critics loved but the audience did not appreciate.  
This was shown by a percentage measure so-called percentage gap or % gap, which is the difference between the rating given by Rotten Potatoes’ critics and that of Rotten Potatoes’ audience.   
The genre, the year of release, more importantly, the budget of each film were added to encourage further interrogations, possible normalisation and relative judgments.

* 1. Dimensions visualised versus available dimensions

The original dataset has seven (7) rows and ninety-two (92) columns. This makes it a 7-dimensional data with 92 instances. The seven dimensions are as follows: *Film (name), critics’ rating (%), audience rating (%), percentage gap (%), the budget of the movie ($ million), year of release, genre.*

The film name, the genre and the year are categorical, the rests convey magnitude.

Contrary to the first 6 dimensions, the last dimension namely the genre may contain multiple dimensions. Thus, a movie can be a drama and action at the same time. This leads us to the first negative critique of the visualisation. In fact, the graphic only showed the first genre for films that have more than one genre. This was surely done for simplicity. Given that the genre was shown using colours, it would not be effective to shown all the possible combinations (More than 30) available using colour. Although this is reasonable because the primary goal of the graphic is to show the gap of each film, the target audience may be interested in querying based on the genre. This is in violation of the principle that good visualisation should convey correctness, and the full truth.

Besides not showing all the genres, the author did not include the actual ratings in the visualisation: only the gaps were displayed. One may argue that we are just interested in the divide, however, having the actual ratings could inform better interpretation of the data. For instance, the movie **Shaun the Sheep Movie** received a rating of 96% from critics and 80% from the audience. Its % gap is therefore 19, relatively ranking 22th (The exact ranking is from the dataset). This could be interpreted as not being “really” loved by the audience chiefly because of the title of the visualisation. Most films with a smaller gap were less appreciated. Thus, showing the critics’ and audience’ ratings should be considered.

In sum, the graphic displayed less than 72% of the available dataset.

* 1. Important visual queries

The important visual queries identifies are listed next.

1. ***What is the % gap of a given film X***? (X is the name of the film)

This query requires finding a particular movie fairly easily on the graphic. This is unfortunately not the case unless the year of release and/or the genre of the film is known by the user performing the query. Thus, grouping by genre with distinct colours and ordering by year is very effective. Finding a particular movie’s % gap is however fairly difficult. Alphabetical ordering could make this easier.

1. ***Which film or genre has the biggest or smallest % gap?***
2. ***What is the budget used to make a given movie X?***

This query may be useful to estimate the resources allocated to the making of a particular movie in relation to how it was received by the audience and the critics. Thus subsequent queries could follow. Such examples are

* + ***What is the biggest budget movie with the largest review split between critics and audience?***
  + ***What is the smallest budget movie with the smaller review split between critics and audience?***

This was relatively well addressed except the use of area, which is hard to quantify for relative judgements. This will be further expanded when dealing with the visual channels.

1. ***What is the genre of a given movie X?***
2. ***What is the average % gap for a particular genre Y?***
3. ***What is the % gap progression over the years?***
4. ***What is the average % gap?***
   1. The use of visual channels
5. Use of colour
6. Identity channels – *Categorical attributes:* spatial region, colour hue, motion or shape
7. Magnitude channels – *Ordered attributes: slide 2 lecture 7*
8. Use of size
9. Use of space
10. Use of depth
11. Expressiveness principle
12. Efficacy principle: Most important attributes: % gap with position: good and movie name not good. Year given importance over name.
    1. Use of design heuristics for visualization
    2. Scene gist
    3. Perception
    4. Attention
    5. Pop-out
    6. Objects and patterns
    7. Meaning
13. Question 2: Synthesis/Redesign
    1. Improvements or redesign
    2. Why it is a better design
    3. Strengths
    4. Weaknesses
    5. Trade-offs

Simplicity vs completeness: colour with few genres or something else with all genre combinations

Ordering names or not?

Name vs Year: few years but many names: easy to map out on a 2D space rather than one D line.

Show every name vs show ratings

Occlusion vs every movie?