## Blockbusters



The frequency table and histogram below show the lengths of the 50 movies nominated for Best Picture (Academy Awards) in the 1980s:

| Length (in minutes) of 1980s Best Picture Nominations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80-89 | 90-99 | 100-109 | 110-119 | 120-129 | 130-139 | 140-149 | 150-159 | 160-169 | 170-179 | 180-189 | 190-199 | 200-209 |
| 0 | 1 | IIII III <br> 8 | HII HIII II <br> 12 | HIII HII IIII <br> 14 |  <br> 4 | 2 | II <br> 2 | III | 0 | 1 1 | III | 0 |

## Length of 1980s Best Picture Nominations



1. a. What are the features of this distribution?
b. Where is its middle?
2. a. How long was a typical Best Picture nomination in the 1980 s?
b. Judging from this data, how long was a "long" movie in the 1980s?
3. If the data was in minutes instead of 10-minute intervals, how would you graph it?

Here is a table of the Best Picture nominations for 2000-2006, together with their lengths.

| Year | Title and Length (in minutes) of 2000-2006 Best Picture Nominations |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Chocolat | Crouching Tiger | Erin Brockovich | Gladiator | Traffic |
|  | 121 | 120 | 130 | 155 | 147 |
| 2001 | A Beautiful Mind | Gosford Park | In the Bedroom | The Fellowship of the Ring | Moulin Rouge |
|  | 135 | 137 | 130 | 178 | 127 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | Chicago | Gangs of New York | The Hours | The Two Towers | The Pianist |
|  | 113 | 167 | 114 | 179 | 150 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | The Return of the King | Lost in Translation | Master and Commander | Mystic River | Seabiscuit |
|  | 201 | 102 | 138 | 137 | 141 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | The Aviator | Finding Neverland | Million Dollar Baby | Ray | Sideways |
|  | 170 | 106 | 132 | Crash | 152 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | Brokeback Mountain | Capote | 114 | Goodnight, and Good Luck. | Munich |
|  | 134 | The Departed | 151 | 141 | 93 |

1. Collate the data in a frequency table similar to the one in Activity One. Then create a histogram.
2. Compare the features of the two histograms. What do you notice? Think of possible reasons for differences.
3. a. What information from the nominations table becomes lost in the histogram?
b. With a classmate, discuss how you could display more of the available information in an interesting graph. Create the graph.
c. What can others learn from your graph?
d. What information from the nominations table doesn't your graph show?
4. Using the data in the nominations table, compare movie lengths by year. You may want to reorganise the data, create a new graph as a starting point, or look at median and mean.
5. Here is the information for the Best Picture nominations for 2007 and 2008.

| Year | Title and Length (in minutes) of 2007-2008 Best Picture Nominations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Atonement | Juno | Michael Clayton | No Country for Old Men | There Will Be Blood |
|  | 123 | 96 | 119 | 122 | 158 |
| 2008 | The Curious Case of Benjamin Button | Frost/Nixon | Milk | The Reader | Slumdog Millionaire |
|  | 166 | 122 | 128 | 124 | 120 |

Add this information to your frequency table and recreate the histogram.
What difference does the new data make to the shape of the graph?

