

TV INTELLIGENTSIA

THE

# Rating Methodology

*The transparent framework behind every TVI score.*

---

VERSION 1.0

April 23, 2026

SIGNATORIES

Jordan Robinson, MD, MPH — Founder and Chief Methodologist

Cordelia Witty, EdS., NCSP — Head of Children's Content (SEL dimension)

# Contents

---

Why this document exists	3
The IQ Score framework	5
Dimension definitions and sub-metrics	7
The SEL dimension (children’s content)	10
Scoring protocol	12
Score categories and database distribution	14
Supplementary dimensions (banked)	16
What TVI does not measure	17
Dispute process	18
Methodology roadmap	19
Limitations and transparency	20
References	21
Appendix A. Sub-metric scoring guide	22
Appendix B. Database summary statistics	23
Appendix C. CASEL framework detail	24
Appendix D. Glossary	25
Version history	26

# 01

## Why this document exists

---

### 1.1 The measurement gap in entertainment

The entertainment industry has extensive infrastructure for measuring *who watches* (Nielsen), *what is in demand* (Parrot Analytics), and *what people say they liked* (Rotten Tomatoes, IMDb). It has no infrastructure for measuring *what the content actually does to the viewer's brain*. TV Intelligentsia was built to fill that gap.

### 1.2 The credibility crisis in existing ratings

Every major rating system in entertainment has a documented structural problem.

Rotten Tomatoes binarizes critic opinion into a Fresh/Rotten vote, then aggregates the votes into a percentage — a methodology that rewards consensus and obscures intensity. A film that nine of ten critics mildly approve of scores higher than one that four of ten critics consider a masterpiece.

Metacritic weights critic scores through an undisclosed proprietary formula, which by definition cannot be evaluated, debated, or reproduced.

IMDb and Letterboxd rely on user-generated ratings vulnerable to review bombing, brigade voting, and cultural-warfare campaigns. The pattern has been visible on major franchise releases from 2019 forward.

Common Sense Media focuses on age-appropriateness — a real service, but a different construct than content quality or cognitive value.

Nielsen measures attention volume, not attention quality.

None of these systems publishes its methodology in a form that can be challenged, reproduced, or version-controlled. TVI is designed as the clean-sheet alternative: a published, version-stamped, change-logged methodology with named signatories accountable for each dimension.

### 1.3 What this document is and is not

This is a published methodology — version-stamped, change-logged, and scheduled for quarterly review. It is a transparent account of how every score in the TVI database is produced, grounded in published cognitive science, and designed to be reproducible by any qualified reviewer applying the same rubric to the same title.

It is *not* a claim of peer-reviewed validation. That is Phase 3 work. TVI's credibility model is honest about its stage: expert authority first (Phase 1, this document), empirical evidence second (Phase 2, inter-rater reliability and outcome correlation), scientific validation third (Phase 3, university partnerships and published studies).

## 1.4 The founder's measurement credential

TVI is led by a founder with specific training in measurement science. Jordan Robinson's Master of Public Health concentration is in research methodology – the discipline that designs measurement instruments, evaluates psychometric validity, establishes inter-rater reliability, and mitigates measurement bias. This is the specific degree that qualifies someone to construct a rating methodology. The methodology is not a physician opining on entertainment. It is a trained measurement scientist applying research methodology to a domain that has never been formally measured.

# 02

## The IQ Score framework

---

### 2.1 The IQ Score defined

The TVI IQ Score is a composite score on a 0–200 scale measuring the intellectual and developmental value of entertainment content across three weighted dimensions. The score answers a single question: *what did watching this actually do to the viewer's brain?*

The IQ Score is a content rating. It is not a measurement of viewer intelligence. It is not a safety rating. It is not an age-appropriateness rating.

### 2.2 The formula

#### THE FORMULA

$$\text{IQ Score} = \text{round}((\text{CS} \times 0.40 + \text{EV} \times 0.35 + \text{EQ} \times 0.25) \times 4)$$

CS = Cognitive Stimulation (0–50)

EV = Educational Value (0–50)

EQ = Entertainment Quality (0–50)

*Result: integer 0–200*

Dimension scores are multiplied by their weights, summed, multiplied by four to produce a 0–200 scale, and rounded to the nearest integer. Maximum composite: 200.

### 2.3 Why these weights

Cognitive Stimulation receives the highest weight (40%) because the research literature consistently identifies cognitive engagement — not entertainment value or educational content — as the primary differentiator between content that produces measurable cognitive effects and content that does not. Four citations support this position directly:

- Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988; Sweller, van Merriënboer, & Paas, 1998) establishes that the mental architecture activated by content varies dramatically with structural complexity, and that the load a viewer must process determines the cognitive work performed.
- Narrative Transportation Theory (Green & Brock, 2000) demonstrates that narrative complexity drives deeper cognitive engagement and better retention of both factual and evaluative information.
- The Limited Capacity Model of Motivated Mediated Message Processing (Lang, 2000; Lang, 2006) links media structural features directly to cognitive resource allocation.
- Madigan et al. (2020) in *JAMA Pediatrics* documents measurable associations between content *type* and developmental outcomes in children — not just duration.

Educational Value receives the second-highest weight (35%) because persistent knowledge transfer — what the viewer retains after the screen goes off — is the dimension most correlated with long-term cognitive benefit in the literature. Fisch (2004) articulates the capacity model for children’s comprehension of educational content; Desmond & Dillman Carpentier (2019) document that educational structure predicts retention; Butler, Zaromb, Lyle, & Roediger (2009) establish that viewers learn factual information from entertainment, accurately or not.

Entertainment Quality receives the lowest weight (25%) because craft, emotional engagement, and production value — while essential for content to function as watchable entertainment — contribute less to measurable cognitive or educational outcomes than the other two dimensions. Excluding entertainment quality entirely, however, would produce absurd results: a poorly made educational film scoring higher than a masterfully crafted one. The 25% weight ensures craft is rewarded without dominating.

## 2.4 The weighting rationale as a design decision

The weights represent informed judgment, not empirical optimization. The literature supports the directional ranking — cognitive engagement, then educational content, then entertainment craft as predictors of cognitive impact — but does not dictate precise percentages. TVI publishes the weights explicitly so they can be evaluated, debated, and, as the empirical base grows, adjusted in future versions. This is the difference between a transparent methodology and a black box.

# 03

## Dimension definitions and sub-metrics

---

Each dimension is scored 0–50 and is itself the average of four sub-metrics, each scored 0–50. Twelve sub-metrics across three dimensions constitute the full scoring rubric.

### 3.1 Cognitive Stimulation — 40% weight

*How hard the viewer's brain works during viewing.* Measures the cognitive resources required to follow, process, and engage with the content.

Sub-metric	What it measures	High-score exemplars	Grounding
Narrative Complexity	Number and interconnection of plot threads, temporal structures, character arcs, thematic layers	Interweaving storylines, non-linear timelines, unreliable narrators, thematic recursion — <i>The Wire</i> , <i>Dark</i>	Mittell (2015), <i>Complex TV</i>
Dialogue Density	Lexical sophistication, information load per line, subtext, conversational complexity	Dialogue that requires active parsing, domain vocabulary, double meanings — <i>The West Wing</i> , <i>Succession</i>	Lang (2000), LC4MP
Cognitive Load	Degree to which the viewer must actively construct meaning rather than passively receive it	Shows where critical information is lost if you look at your phone — <i>Severance</i> , <i>Westworld</i>	Sweller (1988), Cognitive Load Theory
Conceptual Novelty	Introduction of ideas, frameworks, or perspectives the viewer is unlikely to have encountered	Content that teaches you to think about something in a fundamentally new way — <i>Black Mirror</i> , <i>Cosmos</i>	Berlyne (1960), curiosity as a cognitive driver

## 3.2 Educational Value — 35% weight

*What persists beyond viewing.* Measures the extent to which the content transfers durable knowledge, skill, or understanding. Educational value is explicitly not limited to academic content: it includes emotional intelligence, critical thinking, life skills, and knowledge transfer across any domain the viewer might carry into their own life.

Sub-metric	What it measures	High-score exemplars	Grounding
Factual Density	Volume of verifiable, real-world information conveyed per episode or per hour	Content that teaches specific facts the viewer can recall and verify — <i>Cosmos</i> , <i>Chernobyl</i>	Fisch (2004), capacity model
Domain Knowledge Transfer	Depth of expertise in a specific field the viewer gains	Viewer understands a domain they didn't before — medicine, law, history, physics — <i>House M.D.</i> , <i>Band of Brothers</i>	Butler et al. (2009)
Practical Applicability	Whether the knowledge or perspective gained has real-world utility	The viewer can apply something learned to their own life or work	Bandura (1986), social cognitive theory
Historical / Scientific Accuracy	Fidelity to real events, verified facts, and established science	Content that does not fabricate or distort for dramatic convenience — <i>Chernobyl</i> vs. loosely “inspired by” narratives	Mutz & Goldman (2010)

## 3.3 Entertainment Quality — 25% weight

*Craft and engagement.* Measures the technical and artistic quality of the content as a piece of made entertainment.

Sub-metric	What it measures	High-score exemplars	Grounding
Emotional Range	Breadth and depth of emotional experience the content produces	Work that moves beyond a single emotional register — <i>Six Feet Under</i> , <i>BoJack Horseman</i>	Nabi & Green (2015)
Narrative Arc Completion	Degree to which the story delivers on its structural promises	Satisfying resolution of character arcs, thematic payoff — <i>Breaking Bad</i> vs. mid-season algorithmic filler	Brewer & Lichtenstein (1982)

Sub-metric	What it measures	High-score exemplars	Grounding
<b>Production Value</b>	Cinematography, sound design, editing, visual effects, score	Production choices that serve the story rather than substitute for it — <i>Shogun</i> , <i>Chernobyl</i>	Industry-standard craft assessment; expert judgment
<b>Audience Retention</b>	Degree to which the content sustains engaged attention across its runtime	Content that earns the viewer's time minute-by-minute, not just episode-by-episode	Green & Brock (2000)

# O4

## The SEL dimension (children's content)

---

### 4.1 SEL defined and why it is separate

Social-Emotional Learning is scored 0–50 and reported alongside the IQ Score as a distinct measure. It does *not* feed into the IQ Score formula.

SEL measures developmental appropriateness and emotional-skill modeling — a different construct than cognitive or educational quality. A children's show can score 160 IQ and 8 SEL (highly stimulating, minimal social-emotional modeling) or 88 IQ and 48 SEL (minimal cognitive demand but exceptional emotional-development content). Conflating the two would obscure the signal each provides.

### 4.2 The CASEL framework

TVI's SEL dimension uses the CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning) framework — the same framework adopted by K–12 schools nationwide. Five competencies are scored:

CASEL competency	What it measures in content
Self-Awareness	Does the content model characters recognizing their own emotions, strengths, and limitations?
Self-Management	Does the content model emotional regulation, impulse control, and goal-directed behavior?
Social Awareness	Does the content model empathy, perspective-taking, and appreciation for diversity?
Relationship Skills	Does the content model healthy communication, cooperation, and conflict resolution?
Responsible Decision-Making	Does the content model ethical reasoning, consequential thinking, and constructive choices?

## 4.3 The credentialed reviewer

All children's content in the TVI database is reviewed by Cordelia Witty, EdS., NCSP — a licensed School Psychologist and Nationally Certified School Psychologist. The CASEL framework and her credential ensure that SEL scores are grounded in the developmental science used in educational settings, not in subjective impressions.

## 4.4 Anchor calibration scores

SEL scoring is anchored to reference titles that establish the scale. Anchor scores quoted here are pulled live from the TVI database at [tvintelligentsia.com/explore](https://tvintelligentsia.com/explore) at time of publication and may evolve with rescoring; the live database is always authoritative.

- *Daniel Tiger's Neighborhood* — SEL 48. High anchor. Explicit emotional-literacy instruction with clear SEL scaffolding by design; the highest-scored SEL title in the database.
- *Bluey* — SEL 46. High anchor. Exceptional modeling of emotional regulation, family dynamics, imaginative play, and age-appropriate problem-solving.
- *Sesame Street* — SEL 44. Broad SEL range with strong modeling across all five CASEL competencies.
- *Cocomelon* — SEL 8. Low anchor. Minimal emotional-regulation modeling, low social-interaction depth, high stimulation rate without SEL resolution.
- *Baby Shark* — SEL 6. Low anchor. Sensory-driven content with minimal character interaction to model social-emotional skills.

## 4.5 The SEL calibration flag

To prevent Educational Value from being assessed too narrowly — for instance, counting only academic content and ignoring emotional-intelligence or life-skills transfer — every scoring session runs an automated flag: any children's title where  $SEL \geq 40$  and  $EV \leq 25$  is surfaced for manual review. A discrepancy of this size almost always indicates that educational value was scored against an academic-only ceiling rather than the five-dimensional rubric (academic content, emotional intelligence, critical thinking, life skills, knowledge transfer). Flagged titles are reviewed by the scoring team, not auto-corrected.

---

*The IQ Score is a content rating, not an intelligence measurement. Scores are derived from the published methodology applied to specific titles. The current scoring database is authoritative and available at [tvintelligentsia.com/explore](https://tvintelligentsia.com/explore).*

# 05

## Scoring protocol

---

### 5.1 Unit of analysis

Each title is scored as a complete body of work across all seasons, not episode by episode.

Rationale: episode-level scoring introduces volatility that obscures aggregate signal, and the consumer question is *should I watch this show*, not *should I watch this episode*.

Anthology exception. Anthology series where each season is a different narrative work — *True Detective*, *Fargo*, *Black Mirror*, *The White Lotus* — retain season-level entries, because each season is scored as a distinct work. Non-anthology shows keep a single canonical entry covering the entire run.

### 5.2 Scoring process

1. Full viewing. The reviewer completes the title in full — every season, every episode of a serialized narrative. Partial viewing disqualifies a reviewer from scoring.
2. Independent sub-metric scoring. The reviewer scores each of the twelve sub-metrics (0–50) using the rubric definitions in Section 3.
3. Dimension aggregation. Each dimension score is the mean of its four sub-metric scores.
4. Formula application. The IQ Score is computed via the formula in Section 2.
5. SEL scoring (children’s content only). Cordelia Witty scores SEL against the CASEL rubric defined in Section 4.
6. Internal consistency review. Scores are checked against internal consistency benchmarks — for example, a title cannot score 45/50 on Cognitive Stimulation overall while scoring 10/50 on Narrative Complexity without flagging for a sub-metric audit.
7. Calibration sweep. All kids titles are run against the SEL calibration flag described in Section 4.5.

### 5.3 Reviewer qualifications

The current reviewer panel comprises two named methodologists: Jordan Robinson (MD, MPH — research methodology, IQ framework) and Cordelia Witty (EdS., NCSP — children’s content and SEL dimension). As TVI scales, the panel will expand with explicit qualification criteria: demonstrated subject-matter expertise, signed agreement to apply the published rubric, and documented inter-rater reliability testing before scores are published.

## 5.4 Inter-rater reliability (Phase 2)

TVI acknowledges that a two-person reviewer panel is a known limitation of v1.0. Inter-rater reliability testing is a Phase 2 priority: multiple qualified reviewers scoring the same titles independently, with Cohen's kappa or intraclass correlation computed to demonstrate scoring consistency within accepted measurement thresholds. Until this work is completed, TVI scores are expert-reviewed ratings, not statistically validated measurements. The distinction is stated here and on every public-facing score display.

## 5.5 Score integrity protocol

Scores published on tvintelligentsia.com are authoritative. Planning documents, marketing materials, internal drafts, and external citations are not publishable sources for scores. When TVI content cites a score, the score must be verified against the live database at the time of publication. The database is the record; anything else is a reference.

# 06

## Score categories and database distribution

---

### 6.1 The five tiers

Range	Tier	Definition
160–200	Masterclass	Measurably increases domain knowledge or cognitive capacity
130–159	Stimulating	Significantly challenges the viewer intellectually
100–129	Competent	Meaningful engagement above passive consumption
70–99	Passive	Minimal cognitive demand, entertainment-driven
0–69	Numbing	Negligible intellectual engagement

### 6.2 Current database distribution

As of April 23, 2026, the TVI database contains 1,901 scored titles (1,682 adult, 219 children's).

Distribution across tiers:

Tier	Count	Share
Masterclass (160+)	431	22.7%
Stimulating (130–159)	652	34.3%
Competent (100–129)	703	37.0%
Passive (70–99)	96	5.0%
Numbing (<70)	19	1.0%

## 6.3 Distribution analysis

The database skews toward higher-quality content because the initial corpus was built from titles with demonstrated cultural significance, critical acclaim, or sustained audience interest. As the database expands to include more platform-filler content — procedural network television, algorithmic filler, unscripted programming that currently sits outside the corpus — the distribution will shift downward. This is expected and methodologically appropriate: TVI rates what exists, not what it wishes existed.

---

*The IQ Score is a content rating, not an intelligence measurement. Scores are derived from the published methodology applied to specific titles. The current scoring database is authoritative and available at [tvinelligentsia.com/explore](https://tvinelligentsia.com/explore).*

# 07

## Supplementary dimensions (banked)

---

Two additional dimensions are designed and partially implemented. They are documented here to signal methodological depth and roadmap intent, and to prevent future-version additions from appearing ad hoc.

### 7.1 EQ Score — Emotional Intelligence

Scored 0–50. Designed but not yet populated in the public database. Measures how much a title develops or demands emotional intelligence — empathy modeling, self-awareness, emotional regulation, relational complexity, and emotional vocabulary. Applies to both adult and children’s content. *Inside Out* functions as the high-anchor reference calibration point.

Launch criteria for the EQ dimension require (1) a credentialed expert attributor — the equivalent of Cordelia’s role for SEL — and (2) scores populated for a meaningful share of the adult database before public display. The reserved field is present in the database schema so scores can be recorded silently during Phase 2 development without display surfaces needing to change.

### 7.2 Cinematic Score — Music and Soundtrack

Scored 0–50. Measures composition quality, emotional impact, thematic integration, and memorability of a title’s score and soundtrack. Currently populated for 428 titles where soundtrack is a significant artistic element. Reported alongside the IQ Score as a distinct dimension on qualifying titles. Does not feed into the IQ Score formula. Does not apply universally; titles without meaningful soundtrack presence do not carry a Cinematic Score.

# 08

## What TVI does not measure

---

Defining the boundary of the methodology is as important as defining what is inside it.

TVI does not measure age-appropriateness. That is Common Sense Media's domain and they do it well. TVI measures quality and cognitive value, which is a different construct. A show can be age-appropriate and cognitively numbing, or age-inappropriate and intellectually masterful.

TVI does not measure popularity or audience sentiment. That is Nielsen's, IMDb's, and Rotten Tomatoes' domain. A show can be wildly popular and score 82 or relatively obscure and score 189. Popularity and cognitive value are independent axes.

TVI does not measure viewer enjoyment. A viewer may genuinely enjoy a Passive-tier show more than a Masterclass-tier show on a given evening. The IQ Score rates the content, not the experience. Enjoyment is a separate question that TVI explicitly does not answer.

TVI does not make clinical claims about individual viewers. The IQ Score does not predict that watching a 200-rated show will make a specific viewer smarter. It measures the cognitive, educational, and entertainment value of the content itself. Individual cognitive effects depend on attention, context, co-viewing, prior knowledge, and other variables outside TVI's scope.

TVI does not measure political ideology, representation, or values alignment. These are legitimate analytical frames. They are not the frame TVI measures.

# 09

## Dispute process

---

A published methodology is only credible if it can be challenged.

### 9.1 Score disputes

Any member of the public, any creator, and any platform may dispute a specific score by submitting a written challenge to [methodology@tvintelligentsia.com](mailto:methodology@tvintelligentsia.com). A dispute must identify the title, the current score, the sub-metric(s) the challenger believes are misscored, and a reasoned argument grounded in the rubric.

A dispute is not a request to raise or lower a score on taste grounds. A dispute is a claim that the rubric was misapplied. Disputes grounded in taste, political disagreement, or marketing objection are acknowledged but not acted on.

### 9.2 Response timeline

TVI commits to acknowledging every dispute within fourteen days, and to responding with a reasoned decision within thirty days. Decisions fall into three categories:

- Rubric was misapplied. Score adjusted; change logged.
- Rubric was applied correctly, but the dispute surfaces a real edge case. Change-log entry flags the edge case for future rubric refinement.
- Dispute not supported. Score retained; response documents the rubric application.

### 9.3 Methodology challenges

Challenges to the methodology itself — sub-metric definitions, weights, scoring protocols, rubric logic — are welcomed and handled separately from score disputes. Substantive methodology challenges are incorporated into the quarterly review cycle and may produce versioned updates to this document.

### 9.4 Editorial independence

TVI accepts no payment, promotional consideration, or commercial incentive from studios, platforms, distributors, or talent agencies in exchange for scores. A score cannot be bought, negotiated, or withdrawn. This is stated in the founding operating principles and is not subject to dispute.

# 10

## Methodology roadmap

---

### 10.1 Near-term (Phase 1)

- Comparative cohort benchmarking — percentile scoring within genre, platform, decade, and age group.
- Attention-architecture mapping — scene length, cuts per minute, dialogue-to-silence ratios as additional cognitive-load signals.
- Published rubrics — this document.
- Content-creator feedback loop — structured channel for creators to submit corrections to factual claims about their titles.

### 10.2 Medium-term (Phase 2)

- Developmental-stage weighting for children's content.
- Scaffolding assessment — how content introduces complexity across a serialized run.
- Rewatch-decay modeling — how repeated viewing changes the cognitive signal.
- Inter-rater reliability testing and reviewer panel expansion.
- Genre-specific weighting experiments.

### 10.3 Long-term (Phase 3 and beyond)

- University-partnered EEG and fMRI studies correlating TVI scores with measured cognitive activity.
- Pre- and post-viewing knowledge delta testing for educational claims.
- Peer-reviewed publication of validation studies.
- Negative scoring — a cognitive-cost dimension distinct from the current baseline of zero.

# 11

## Limitations and transparency

---

Stating what TVI does not yet have is the section that builds the most credibility with sophisticated readers. It is stated here in full.

11.1 The database is 1,901 titles. This is sufficient for consumer-facing recommendations and genre-level aggregation. It is below the threshold for statistically robust claims about entire platform catalogs. Platform-level comparisons (for example, “Netflix’s average IQ Score”) are reported with explicit sampling caveats.

11.2 The reviewer panel is two people. This is a known limitation of v1.0. Inter-rater reliability testing and panel expansion are Phase 2 priorities. Until inter-rater reliability is documented, TVI scores are expert-reviewed ratings, not statistically validated measurements.

11.3 The weighting is judgment-based. The 40/35/25 split is informed by the literature cited in Section 2.3 but is not empirically optimized. Future versions may adjust weights based on outcome data.

11.4 The score is a composite. Like any composite metric, it compresses multidimensional information into a single number. Users who want dimensional detail should consult the per-dimension breakdowns available on [tvintelligentsia.com/explore](https://tvintelligentsia.com/explore).

11.5 There is no peer-reviewed validation yet. TVI’s phased credibility model is explicit: expert authority first (Phase 1), empirical evidence second (Phase 2), scientific validation third (Phase 3). This document is Phase 1 output. Claims of scientific validation in any TVI marketing or press material are unauthorized and should be reported.

11.6 The scoring corpus reflects reviewer access. Titles available on major streaming platforms and via physical or digital rental are accessible. Titles restricted to specific regional markets or behind one-off paywalls may be underrepresented. The database documents which streaming platforms were sampled for each scoring cohort.

# References

---

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, Arousal, and Curiosity*. McGraw-Hill.
- Brewer, W. F., & Lichtenstein, E. H. (1982). Stories are to entertain: A structural-affect theory of stories. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 6(5–6), 473–486.
- Butler, A. C., Zaromb, F. M., Lyle, K. B., & Roediger, H. L. (2009). Using popular films to enhance classroom learning: The good, the bad, and the interesting. *Psychological Science*, 20(9), 1161–1168.
- CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning). (2020). *CASEL's SEL Framework: What Are the Core Competence Areas and Where Are They Promoted?* Chicago, IL: CASEL.
- Desmond, R., & Dillman Carpentier, F. (2019). *Media and the Well-Being of Children and Adolescents* (updated edition). Oxford University Press.
- Fisch, S. M. (2004). *Children's Learning from Educational Television: Sesame Street and Beyond*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 701–721.
- Lang, A. (2000). The limited capacity model of mediated message processing. *Journal of Communication*, 50(1), 46–70.
- Lang, A. (2006). Using the limited capacity model of motivated mediated message processing to design effective cancer communication messages. *Journal of Communication*, 56(s1), S57–S80.
- Madigan, S., McArthur, B. A., Anhorn, C., Eirich, R., & Christakis, D. A. (2020). Associations between screen use and child language skills: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 174(7), 665–675.
- Mark, G. (2023). *Attention Span: A Groundbreaking Way to Restore Balance, Happiness and Productivity*. Hanover Square Press.
- Mittell, J. (2015). *Complex TV: The Poetics of Contemporary Television Storytelling*. NYU Press.
- Mutz, D. C., & Goldman, S. K. (2010). Mass media. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 241–258). SAGE.
- Nabi, R. L., & Green, M. C. (2015). The role of a narrative's emotional flow in promoting persuasive outcomes. *Media Psychology*, 18(2), 137–162.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. G. W. C. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10(3), 251–296.
- Wolf, M. (2018). *Reader, Come Home: The Reading Brain in a Digital World*. HarperCollins.

# 13

## Appendix A. Sub-metric scoring guide

---

Each sub-metric is scored on a 0–50 scale using the following anchors. A reviewer applies each anchor by asking whether the title clearly clears that threshold; if not, they move down to the next anchor.

Score	Anchor	Meaning
50	Definitional exemplar	Sets the standard for this sub-metric in the database. Reference titles at 50 include <i>The Wire</i> (Narrative Complexity), <i>Succession</i> (Dialogue Density), <i>Severance</i> (Cognitive Load), <i>Cosmos</i> (Factual Density), <i>Chernobyl</i> (Historical Accuracy).
40	Exceptional	Demonstrates the sub-metric at a level clearly above the stimulating tier but short of definitional.
30	Strong	Consistent, intentional, and reliably present. Typical of stimulating-tier titles.
20	Present	The sub-metric is visible but intermittent or modest in scope. Typical of competent-tier titles.
10	Minimal	The sub-metric is detectable only occasionally. Typical of passive-tier titles.
0	Absent	The sub-metric is not present or is actively undermined.

Reviewers may score at any integer value between anchors. Half-point increments are not used.

# 14

## Appendix B. Database summary statistics

---

*As of April 23, 2026.*

Total scored titles: 1,901

- Adult titles: 1,682
- Children's titles: 219

Distribution by tier

- Masterclass (160+): 431 (22.7%)
- Stimulating (130–159): 652 (34.3%)
- Competent (100–129): 703 (37.0%)
- Passive (70–99): 96 (5.0%)
- Numbing (<70): 19 (1.0%)

Supplementary dimension coverage

- SEL scored: 219 (all children's titles)
- Cinematic scored: 428 titles where soundtrack is a significant artistic element
- EQ (Emotional Intelligence) scored: 0 public. Reserved field present in schema pending Phase 2 launch criteria.

Platform and decade breakdowns are maintained internally and available on request to credentialed researchers.

# 15

## Appendix C. CASEL framework detail

---

The SEL dimension scored in Section 4 follows the five CASEL competencies. Each is assessed in the context of children's content through the questions below.

**Self-Awareness.** Does the content show characters identifying their own emotions? Recognizing personal strengths and limitations? Naming feelings accurately? Modeling the development of self-confidence?

**Self-Management.** Does the content show characters regulating emotions under pressure? Practicing impulse control? Setting goals and working toward them? Demonstrating stress-management techniques appropriate to the developmental stage?

**Social Awareness.** Does the content show characters taking others' perspectives? Practicing empathy across demographic lines? Recognizing cultural, familial, and individual differences without flattening them? Respecting people unlike themselves?

**Relationship Skills.** Does the content show characters communicating clearly? Cooperating across difference? Building healthy relationships? Resolving conflicts constructively? Seeking and offering help?

**Responsible Decision-Making.** Does the content show characters considering consequences? Applying ethical reasoning appropriate to the developmental stage? Evaluating choices? Taking responsibility for actions?

Each competency is scored on a 0–10 subscale. The five subscale scores sum to the 0–50 SEL score.

# 16

## Appendix D. Glossary

---

**CASEL.** The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning — the nonprofit organization that maintains the SEL framework used in K–12 education and in TVI’s SEL dimension.

**Cinematic Score.** A 0–50 dimension measuring composition quality, emotional impact, thematic integration, and memorability of a title’s score and soundtrack. Reported alongside the IQ Score where applicable. Does not feed into the IQ Score formula.

**Cognitive Stimulation (CS).** The first dimension of the IQ Score. Measures how hard the viewer’s brain works during viewing. Weighted at 40%.

**Composite score.** A single metric computed from multiple sub-metrics. The IQ Score is a composite of Cognitive Stimulation, Educational Value, and Entertainment Quality.

**Educational Value (EV).** The second dimension of the IQ Score. Measures what persists beyond viewing — durable knowledge, skill, or understanding. Includes academic, emotional, practical, and critical-thinking transfer. Weighted at 35%.

**Entertainment Quality (EQ).** The third dimension of the IQ Score. Measures craft and engagement. Weighted at 25%. *Note: within this document, “EQ” in the IQ formula refers to Entertainment Quality. A separate, banked “EQ Score — Emotional Intelligence” dimension is described in Section 7.1 and will carry a distinct display label when launched.*

**Inter-rater reliability.** The statistical consistency of scores produced by independent reviewers applying the same rubric to the same title. A Phase 2 deliverable for TVI.

**IQ Score.** The composite 0–200 content-rating score published by TVI. Not a measurement of viewer intelligence.

**Masterclass / Stimulating / Competent / Passive / Numbing.** The five tier categories defined in Section 6.

**SEL.** Social-Emotional Learning. A 0–50 dimension applied to children’s content and scored against the CASEL framework. Does not feed into the IQ Score formula.

**Sub-metric.** One of the twelve constituent measures that average to produce a dimension score. Each sub-metric is scored 0–50.

# Version history

---

Version	Date	Changes	Signatories
0.1	April 19, 2026	Internal draft. Established dimensional framework, scoring rubric, SEL framework, and integrity protocols. Not distributed.	Robinson, Witty
1.0	April 23, 2026	Initial public release. Expanded Section 3 with per-sub-metric peer-reviewed citations. Separated SEL into Section 4 with credentialed-reviewer attribution and anchor scores. Added Section 7 “Supplementary Dimensions (Banked)”. Added formal dispute process (Section 9). Added References and Appendices A–D. Distribution figures updated to 1,901-title baseline.	Robinson, Witty

*Next formal methodology review: Q3 2026.*

*The IQ Score is a content rating, not an intelligence measurement. Scores are derived from the published methodology applied to specific titles by credentialed reviewers. The current scoring database is authoritative; it is available at [tvintelligentsia.com/explore](https://tvintelligentsia.com/explore). Scoring disputes are handled per the protocol defined in Section 9. TVI accepts no payment or promotional consideration in exchange for scores.*

© 2026 TV Intelligentsia, Inc. All rights reserved.

Reproduction of this document in full is permitted with attribution.