

Values of Protagonists in Best Pictures and Blockbusters: Implications for Marketing

Douglas Charles Beckwith
University of Phoenix

ABSTRACT

Understanding the personal values of protagonists in films can provide a foundation upon which to build film marketing campaigns. The research discussed below focused on the personal values of protagonists in 93 films comprising three samples released in the United States between 1996 and 2005 noteworthy for their eminent creativity and/or high profitability. The method used was content analysis with coding based on the adaptations of the Rokeach value descriptors. The most important personal values related to goals were determined to be family security, self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, and true friendship (in all three samples); mature love and wisdom (in two samples); and inner harmony and national security (in one sample each). The most important personal values related to desirable behaviors were being ambitious, capable, courageous, helpful, loving, and responsible (in all three samples); and being honest (in one sample). Longitudinal analyses of the value hierarchies that changed in significance from beginning to end of the films indicated a shift from self-concern and materialism to societal concerns and altruism. The content analysis methodology used in this study has implications for marketing professionals in that it reveals means of analyzing popular films as source material to garner insights into the personal values of the consumers who attend the films. © 2009 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this study was to determine the nature of personal values held by film protagonists in award-winning films and/or highly profitable ones. This study analyzed the behavior of film protagonists in three samples of films to understand better the underlying types, ranking, and frequencies of personal values portrayed in them. All films in the study were released in the United States for commercial distribution from 1996 through 2005. The first sample contained 43 "Best Picture" films that had won or been nominated for the Best Picture award by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences in the United States. The second sample contained 43 "Blockbusters," the top five films that generated the highest worldwide revenues for each of the ten years in the study as reported by Box Office Mojo (2006). The third sample contained the seven films that were "both" Best Pictures and blockbusters, hence only 43 films in the Best Picture and Blockbuster samples instead of 50.

Personal values were selected as the topics of study because they are fundamental to understanding and explaining human motivations, actions, and interactions (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). The personal values of *film protagonists* were chosen because protagonists are generally the characters in films with whom audience members identify or empathize. *Commercial motion pictures* distributed in the United States were evaluated because movies are a readily accessible major form of entertainment in the United States and worldwide. *Best Pictures* were chosen because these films were deemed to be creative by American motion picture industry standard bearers. *Blockbusters* were selected because they have demonstrated worldwide audience appeal, as seen in their commercial success. According to a recent industry profile of the global film and entertainment sectors (Global Movies, 2005), in 2004 motion pictures financed and produced by American companies or companies with substantial operations in the United States earned \$80.4 billion in revenues in movie theaters and the home video market worldwide. The United States accounted for 44.3% of that market share; the rest of the world claimed the remaining 55.7% of the market (p. 10). While there is no formula to convert these movie earnings into specific numbers of audience members, these figures indicate that vast numbers of people are seeing films that are intricately intertwined with American society.

The research design of the study was quantitative content analysis of values portrayed by protagonists in the films (Berelson, 1952; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002; Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998; Weber, 1990). Coding of the films was conducted by two trained researchers. Inter-rater reliability of >0.8 was established through Spearman rank correlation coefficients. Each film was coded at two points during the film: the beginning (20% of the length of the film) and the end. After inter-rater reliability was established in a pilot study, the researchers viewed and coded all films in their entirety for an overlap of 100%. The coding form used in this study derived from the work of Milton Rokeach (1973). It included two lists of values that Rokeach determined to be the most common to most cultures throughout the world. Although these values are shared by all cultures, Rokeach believed that each culture is unique in how it ranks the priority of those values. For legal reasons, it must be stated that the Rokeach Value Survey *was not* used in this research, only the value descriptors created by Rokeach and published by him on several occasions. *The Nature of Human Values* (1973) and *Understanding Human Values: Individual*

and *Societal* (1979) are perhaps the works most widely known. For a discussion of the Rokeach value descriptors, see Beckwith (2007).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What will median rankings of protagonist personal values at the beginning and end of 43 Best Pictures, 43 Blockbusters, and seven films that are both Best Pictures and Blockbusters reveal about the hierarchy of protagonist values in these films?
2. Based upon the median rankings of protagonist values at the beginning and end of Best Pictures, Blockbusters, and films that are both Best Pictures and Blockbusters, are there any changes that can be observed?
3. Are the protagonist hierarchies of values similar or different at the end of Best Pictures, Blockbusters, and films that are both Best Pictures and Blockbusters?

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Contemporary Social Science Perspectives on Personal Values

A number of contemporary American and European anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, and other social scientists have described values as mental constructs that enable humans to determine the goodness, rightness, and desirability of actions and attitudes among members of a society and culture. Values are essential because they prescribe preferred actions, ways of being, and ways people should live their lives to create and maintain peaceful, cooperative societies. Kluckhohn (1951) defined a value as “a conception, explicit or implicit . . . of the ‘desirable’ which influences the selections [human beings make] from available modes, means, and ends of actions” (p. 395). These conceptions of the desirable are not behaviors; rather, they are mental constructs that give rise, in part, to human behaviors. Values help people decide for themselves what is good and what is bad. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) stated that a personal value serves as “a criterion to determine a choice from existing alternatives. It is the concept that an individual or group has regarding the desirable” (p. 22). Hall (1989) defined values more poetically as “deep cultural undercurrents [that] structure life in subtle but highly consistent ways that are not consciously formulated. Like the invisible jet streams in the skies that determine the course of a storm, these hidden currents shape our lives” (p. 12).

Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1960) described a value as “a belief upon which man acts by preference” (p. 454). This definition assumes, of course, that people *know* their own values as well as the values of their culture. In this case, *knowing* is not necessarily the ability to recall and explain. Instead, people know their values by sensing what feels right to them, what intuitively makes sense, and by knowing how they are to behave without conscious thought about it. Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) pointed out that most personal values are acquired when we are so young that we are not aware of the process of acquisition. Because values are acquired so early in life, “many values remain unconscious to those

who hold them. Therefore they cannot be discussed, nor can they be directly observed by outsiders. They can only be inferred from the way people act under various circumstances" (p. 10).

Williams (1968) considered values to be the standards of desirability that transcend specific situations. They provide the basis for particular judgments about behavior and practices in any specific society. They are "the criteria for guiding behavior because they possess content and emotion and they contribute to social reality" (p. 440). Kerlinger (1973) described values as "culturally weighted preference that put things, ideas, and behavior on approval-disapproval continua, and imply choices among courses of action and thinking" (p. 499). More fundamentally, Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) stated that values form the core of a culture.

Values are broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others. Values are feelings with an arrow to it: a plus or minus side. They deal with evil versus good, dirty versus clean, dangerous versus safe, forbidden versus permitted, decent versus indecent, moral versus immoral, ugly versus beautiful, unnatural versus natural, abnormal versus normal, paradoxical versus logical, and irrational versus rational. (p. 8)

The important functions of values are manifested in many ways. They help people decide what position to take on important social issues. They lay the foundation for their decisions as to which political party to join or with which to affiliate. They tell people what standards to use when presenting themselves in society and when evaluating or judging other members of society. As personal standards, they are essential to the process of making comparisons and contrasts. They help people decide what is moral and ethical. They provide the bases for persuasion and influence in that they allow people to determine what beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors of others are worth supporting or necessary to challenge. From a psychological point of view, values provide the standards for human beings to rationalize their own beliefs, attitudes, and actions to form personal feelings of morality and competency, both of which are integral to maintaining and enhancing self-esteem (Rokeach, 1973).

METHOD

Research Design

The research design for this study was based in quantitative content analysis of protagonists' personal values found in 93 films distributed commercially in the United States from 1996 through 2005. The units of data collection and the units of data analysis were the individual films in the samples, all of which are available in DVD format. The samples included 93 feature films that have been recognized for their eminent creativity and/or their top-ranking box office receipts.

Data Analysis

Coding of the 93 films was conducted by the author and a trained research assistant. The training process included the establishment of inter-rater reliability

in a pilot study. For the study, each coder viewed all 93 films for an overlap of 100%. Coding was accomplished using a coding form derived from the Rokeach value descriptors discussed above. See Beckwith (2007) for the coding book and form used. Based on the findings, the 18 terminal values and the 18 instrumental values were ranked in each film sample in order of importance to the protagonist in each film. After median ranks were determined for all variables, they were ranked in order of importance to determine the overall value hierarchy for protagonists at the beginning and end of each data set.

RESULTS

The Protagonists

The demographic characteristics of the protagonists that were observed and recorded were gender, ethnicity, nationality, age, and socioeconomic status (SES). Age and SES are presented in ranges, so they are approximate to the protagonists. In a few films based on biographies, the protagonists started as youths and grew to old age; in those films, the age was recorded as indeterminate. The findings are displayed in Table 1. Based on frequencies of characteristics, the composite protagonists in the Best Pictures and Blockbuster categories were identical—a white American male, age 31 to 40, who earned up to \$39,999 per year—but both composites were misleading. As seen in Table 1, the actual demographic characteristics were more widely dispersed.

The Creative Aspects of the Films

Creative aspects of the films reported refer to the artistic choices over which the filmmakers exercised creative control. The artistic aspects of the 93 films encompassed literary form (comedy or drama), film setting (contemporary or period), genre (action, biography, character study, crime, fantasy, horror, musical, mystery/suspense, social or political issues, romance, science fiction, war, and western), live action or animation, primary language, color or black and white, and length in minutes. The findings are presented in Table 2.

In addition, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) ratings of the films, over which the filmmakers had no control, are included in Table 2. The MPAA is an independent trade association that assigns ratings to films based on the degree of sexuality, profanity, and violence in them. The MPAA ratings are as follows:

1. G: General Audiences
2. PG: Parental Guidance Suggested
3. PG-13: Parents Strongly Cautioned
4. R: Restricted; Under 17 Requires Accompanying Parent or Adult Guardian
5. NC-17: No One Under 17 Admitted. (MPAA, 2007, Ratings)

Data Analysis Based on Research Question 1

What will composite rank orders of protagonist personal values at the beginning and end of 43 Best Pictures, 43 Blockbusters, and seven films that are both Best

Table 1. Demographic Details for Protagonists.

	BP* Count (%)	BB Count (%)	Both Count (%)		BP Count (%)	BB Count (%)	Both Count (%)
<i>Gender</i>				<i>Gender</i>			
Male	31 (72%)	40 (93%)	6 (86%)	Female	12 (28%)	3 (7%)	1 (14%)
<i>Male Ethnicity</i>				<i>Female Ethnicity</i>			
White	29 (94%)	30 (74%)	6 (100%)	White	11 (92%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)
Black	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	—	Black	—	—	—
Hispanic	1 (3%)	—	—	Hispanic	—	—	—
East Asian	—	—	—	East Asian	1 (8%)	—	—
Semitic	—	1 (3%)	—	Semitic	—	—	—
Non-human	—	7 (18%)	—	Non-Human	—	—	—
<i>Male Nationality</i>				<i>Female Nationality</i>			
American	22 (72%)	21 (53%)	2 (33%)	American	5 (42%)	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
Mexican	1 (3%)	—	—	Mexican	—	—	—
European	6 (19%)	8 (20%)	1 (17%)	European	6 (50%)	1 (33%)	—
Chinese	—	—	—	Chinese	1 (8%)	—	—
Israeli	1 (3%)	—	—	Israeli	—	—	—
Australian / NZ	1 (3%)	—	—	Australian / NZ	—	—	—
Middle Eastern	—	1 (3%)	—	Middle Eastern	—	—	—

Non-earthbound beings	—	3 (7%)	—	Non-earthbound beings	—	—
Earthbound fantasy human, non-human	—	7 (17%)	3 (50%)	Earthbound fantasy human, non-human	—	—
<i>Male Age</i>				<i>Female Age</i>		
1 to 10	—	2 (5%)	—	1 to 10	—	1 (33%)
11 to 20	—	6 (15%)	—	11 to 20	—	—
21 to 30	8 (26%)	8 (20%)	1 (16%)	21 to 30	8 (67%)	1 (100%)
31 to 40	10 (32%)	12 (30%)	1 (16%)	31 to 40	3 (25%)	1 (33%)
41 to 50	7 (23%)	5 (13%)	1 (16%)	—	—	—
51 to 60	4 (13%)	3 (8%)	—	51 to 60	1 (08%)	—
Unable to determine	2 (06%)	4 (9%)	3 (50%)	Unable to determine	—	—
<i>Male SES</i>				<i>Female SES</i>		
\$0–39,999	18 (58%)	12 (29%)	2 (33%)	\$0–39,999	7 (58%)	3 (100%)
\$40,000–79,999	4 (13%)	6 (15%)	—	\$40,000	—	—
\$80 +	9 (29%)	11 (28%)	1 (17%)	–79,999	2 (17%)	—
NA	—	11 (28%)	3 (50%)	\$80 +	3 (25%)	—
				NA	—	—

* BP = Best Pictures, BB = Blockbusters, and Both indicates films in both categories.

Table 2. Creative Aspects.

	Best Pictures	Blockbuster	Both
<i>Count (%)</i>	43 (100%)	43 (100%)	7 (100%)
<i>Literary Form</i>			
Comedy	9 (21%)	17 (40%)	7 (100%)
Drama	34 (79%)	26 (60%)	—
<i>Film Setting</i>			
Contemporary	17 (40%)	31 (72%)	1 (14%)
Period piece	26 (60%)	12 (28%)	6 (86%)
<i>Genre</i>			
Action	2 (05%)	11 (26%)	1 (14%)
Biography	9 (20%)	—	—
Character study	17 (41%)	2 (5%)	—
Crime	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	—
Fantasy	—	16 (36%)	3 (46%)
Horror	—	—	1 (14%)
Musical	2 (5%)	—	—
Social issues/political	4 (9%)	—	—
Romance	5 (11%)	2 (5%)	1 (14%)
Science fiction	—	11 (26%)	—
War	1 (2%)	—	1 (14%)
<i>Live Action or Animated</i>			
Live action	43 (100%)	33 (77%)	7 (100%)
Animated	—	10 (23%)	—
<i>Primary Language</i>			
English	41 (95%)	42 (98%)	7 (100%)
Other language	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	—
<i>Color or Black and White</i>			
Color	42 (98%)	43 (100%)	7 (100%)
Black and White	1 (2%)	—	—
<i>Length</i>			
Mean in minutes	131	121	170
<i>MPAA Rating</i>			
G: General Audiences	—	7 (16%)	—
PG: Parental Guidance Suggested	3 (7%)	10 (23%)	—
PG-13: Parents Strongly Cautioned	13 (30%)	20 (47%)	5 (71%)
R: Restricted; Under 17 Requires accompanying parent or adult guardian	27 (63%)	6 (14%)	2 (29%)

Pictures and Blockbusters reveal about the hierarchy of protagonist values in these films?

Best Pictures. The lead researcher's experience coding over 100 films revealed that the 18 Rokeach terminal and 18 instrumental values in any sample usually fell into three groups: a top tier of approximately six values that were obvious and clearly very important to the protagonists, a middle tier of six values that appeared to be somewhat important but whose actual importance was difficult to determine because of their limited and sporadic manifestations in the films, and a bottom tier of six values that were clearly not important to the protagonists or simply not manifested at all. Therefore, the hierarchies of values discussed below focus on values of top-tier importance to the protagonists.

Table 3. Best Pictures Terminal Values.

Ranking	Beginning	Ranking	End
1	Accomplishment	1	Inner harmony
2	Comfortable life	2	Family security
2	Self-respect	2	Self-respect
4	Freedom	4	Wisdom
4	Social recognition	5	Accomplishment
6	Family security	5	True friendship
6	Happiness	—	—

Table 4. Best Pictures Instrumental Values.

Ranking	Beginning	Ranking	End
1	Ambitious	1	Loving
2	Capable	2	Courageous
3	Responsible	2	Responsible
4	Self-Controlled	4	Helpful
5	Courageous	5	Honest
6	Imaginative	6	Ambitious
6	Independent	6	Capable
6	Loving	—	—

Tables 3 and 4 present the composite rank orders of the medians for the Rokeach terminal and instrumental values in Best Pictures. Exemplars of top-tier terminal values (see Table 3) and protagonists who held them at the end of the films were: inner harmony, John Nash in *A Beautiful Mind* (Howard, 2001); family security, Officer Ryan in *Crash* (Haggis, 2005), and self-respect, Ed Exley in *L.A. Confidential* (Hanson, 1997) (a tie); wisdom, Lester Burnham in *American Beauty* (Mendes, 1999); and a sense of accomplishment, Jeffrey Wigand in *The Insider* (Mann, 1999), and true friendship, Miles in *Sideways* (Payne, 2004) (a tie).

Exemplars of top-tier instrumental values (see Table 4) and protagonists holding them were: being loving, Guido in *Life is Beautiful* (Benigni, 1998); courageous, Maggie in *Million Dollar Baby* (Eastwood, 2004), and responsible, Ray Charles in *Ray* (Hackford, 2004) (a tie); helpful, Erin in *Erin Brockovich* (Soderbergh, 2000a); honest, Javier Rodriguez in *Traffic* (Soderbergh, 2000b); and ambitious, Howard Hughes in *The Aviator* (Scorsese, 2004), and capable, Elizabeth in *Elizabeth* (Kapur, 1998) (a tie).

Blockbusters. Tables 5 and 6 present the rank orderings for Blockbuster films. Exemplars of top-tier terminal values (see Table 5) and protagonists holding them were: family security, Marlin in *Finding Nemo* (Stanton, 2003); a sense of accomplishment, Danny in *Ocean's 11* (Soderbergh, 2001); true friendship, Woody in *Toy Story 2* (Lasseter, Unkrich, & Bannon, 1999); self-respect, Ethan in *Mission: Impossible* (DePalma, 1996); and mature love, Neo in *The Matrix Reloaded* (Wachowski & Wachowski, 2003), and wisdom, Nick in *What Women Want* (Meyers, 2000) (a tie). Exemplars of top-tier instrumental values (see Table 6)

Table 5. Blockbusters Terminal Values.

Ranking	Beginning	Ranking	End
1	Accomplishment	1	Family security
1	Exciting life	2	Accomplishment
1	Freedom	3	True friendship
4	Comfortable life	4	Self-respect
4	Happiness	5	Mature love
4	Self-Respect	5	Wisdom

Table 6. Blockbusters Instrumental Values.

Ranking	Beginning	Ranking	End
1	Ambitious	1	Helpful
2	Capable	2	Courageous
2	Courageous	3	Ambitious
2	Helpful	3	Loving
2	Responsible	5	Responsible
6	Imaginative	6	Capable
6	Self-controlled	—	—

and protagonists were: being helpful, Aladar in *Dinosaur* (Zondag & Leighton, 2000); courageous, Harry Stamper in *Armageddon* (Bay, 1998); ambitious, Harry Potter in *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* (Cuaron, 2004), and loving, Mr. Incredible in *The Incredibles* (Bird, 2004) (a tie); responsible, Peter Parker in *Spider-Man* (Raimi, 2002); and capable, Harry in *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire* (Newell, 2005).

Films in Both Categories. Tables 7 and 8 present the rank orderings of values for films that were both Best Pictures and Blockbusters. Exemplars of top-tier terminal values and protagonists were: family security, Sam in *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* (Jackson, 2003); true friendship, Maximus in *Gladiator* (Scott, 2000); mature love, Rose in *Titanic* (Cameron, 1997); a sense of accomplishment, John Miller in *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg, 1998), and self-respect, Frodo in *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* (Jackson, 2001) (a tie); and national security, Aragorn in *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* (Jackson, 2002). Exemplars of top-tier instrumental values (see Table 8)

Table 7. Films in Both Categories Terminal Values.

Ranking	Beginning	Ranking	End
1	Family security	1	Family security
2	True friendship	2	True friendship
3	Accomplishment	3	Mature love
4	World peace	4	Accomplishment
5	Happiness	4	Self-respect
5	Self-respect	6	National security

Table 8. Films in Both Categories Instrumental.

Ranking	Beginning	Ranking	End
1	Courageous	1	Helpful
2	Helpful	2	Courageous
3	Ambitious	3	Ambitious
4	Responsible	4	Responsible
5	Capable	5	Capable
6	Honest	5	Loving

and protagonists were: being helpful, Aragorn in *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* (Jackson, 2002); courageous, Maximus in *Gladiator* (Scott, 2000); ambitious, John Miller in *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg, 1998); responsible, Maximus in *Gladiator* (Scott, 2000); and capable, John Miller in *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg, 1998), and loving, Rose in *Titanic* (Cameron, 1997) (a tie).

Data Analysis Based on Research Question 2

Based upon the composite rank order of protagonist values at the beginning and end of Best Pictures, Blockbusters, and films that are both Best Pictures and Blockbusters, are there changes that can be observed?

Table 9 displays the changes in terminal values that took place from the beginning to the end of the three film samples. In particular, the values for Best Pictures that were of top-tier importance throughout the films were, in alphabetical order, family security, self-respect, and a sense of accomplishment. Values that rose to top-tier importance by the end of the films were inner harmony, true friendship, and wisdom. For Blockbusters, the values of top-tier importance at the beginning and end of the films were self-respect and a sense of accomplishment. Other values joining the top-tier by the end were family security, mature love, true friendship, and wisdom. Values of top-tier importance through the films that were in both categories were family security, self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, and true friendship. The values of mature love and national security rose to top-tier prominence by the end of these films. (See Table 9.)

Table 10 presents the changes in top-tier instrumental values from the beginning to end of the three film samples. Those values that did not change in Best Pictures were being ambitious, capable, courageous, loving, and responsible. They were joined by the end of the films by being helpful and honest. The top-tier instrumental values of greatest importance to protagonists at the beginning and end of Blockbusters were being ambitious, capable, courageous, helpful, and responsible. Being a loving person was added by the end of these films. The instrumental values that remained the same throughout for films in both categories were being ambitious, capable, courageous, helpful, and responsible. The value of being loving joined this list by the end of the films as well. (See Table 10.)

Data Analysis Based on Research Question 3

In what ways are the protagonist hierarchies of values similar or different at the end of Best Pictures, Blockbusters, and films that are both Best Pictures and Blockbusters?

Table 9. Differences in Top-Tier Terminal Values—Beginning to End.

	Very Important, Beginning	Somewhat Important, Beginning	Not Important, Beginning
Best Pictures			
<i>Very Important, End</i>	Family security Self-respect Sense of accomplishment	Inner harmony True friendship	Wisdom
<i>Somewhat Important, End</i>	Comfortable life Freedom Happiness	—	—
<i>Not Important, End</i>	Social recognition	—	—
Blockbusters			
<i>Very Important, End</i>	Self-respect Sense of accomplishment	Family security True friendship	Mature love Wisdom
<i>Somewhat Important, End</i>	Comfortable life Freedom Happiness	—	—
<i>Not Important, End</i>	Exciting life	—	—
Both			
<i>Very Important, End</i>	Family security Self-respect Sense of accomplishment True friendship	—	Mature love National security
<i>Somewhat Important, End</i>	Happiness World at peace	—	—
<i>Not Important, End</i>	—	—	—

Few differences among the terminal and instrumental values were found to be of great importance across the three samples of films. While it had been speculated that there might be sufficient differences among the value hierarchies to suggest a distinctive value hierarchy for protagonists in eminently creative films, the findings clearly indicated otherwise. Four of the six top-tier terminal values were shared across the three samples: a sense of accomplishment, family security, self-respect, and true friendship. Six of the seven top-tier instrumental values were common to the three samples: being ambitious, capable, courageous, helpful, loving, and responsible. The implications for creativity research were clear: Personal value hierarchies were not indicators of films likely to be determined to be eminently creative. Tables 11 and 12 list the similarities and differences among ranking for the top-tier values in the three samples. The values listed were top-tier in at least one of the three samples.

Table 10. Differences in Top-Tier Instrumental Values—Beginning to End.

	Very Important, Beginning	Somewhat Important, Beginning	Not Important, Beginning
Best Pictures			
<i>Very Important, End</i>	Ambitious Capable Courageous Loving Responsible	Helpful Honest	—
<i>Somewhat Important, End</i>	Independent Imaginative Self-controlled	—	—
<i>Not Important, End</i>	—	—	—
Blockbusters			
<i>Very Important, End</i>	Ambitious Capable Courageous Helpful Responsible	Loving	—
<i>Somewhat Important, End</i>	Imaginative Self-controlled	—	—
<i>Not Important, End</i>	—	—	—
Both			
<i>Very Important, End</i>	Ambitious Capable Courageous Helpful Responsible	Loving	—
<i>Somewhat Important, End</i>	Honest	—	—
<i>Not Important, End</i>	—	—	—

Table 11. Ranking at End of Films Across Film Samples—Terminal Values.

	Best Picture	Blockbuster	Both
Sense of accomplishment	5	2	4
Family security	2	1	1
Inner harmony	1	7	7
Mature love	9	5	3
National security	17	9	6
Self-respect	2	4	4
True friendship	5	3	2
Wisdom	4	5	9

Table 12. Ranking at End of Films across Film Samples—Instrumental Values.

	Best Picture	Blockbuster	Both
Ambitious	6	3	3
Capable	6	6	5
Courageous	2	2	2
Helpful	4	1	1
Honest	5	12	7
Loving	1	3	5
Responsible	2	5	4

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide insights into the most important goals and modes of behavior aspired to by the filmmakers, audience members, film industry gatekeepers, and many members of American society. This assertion derives from (1) Dilthey's assertion (1985) about the importance of cultural artifacts in understanding human nature, and (2) the assertions made by researchers regarding the nature of creativity and the inherent interaction among creators, audience, and gatekeepers in the process of creation and evaluation of the creative product.

First, Dilthey (1985) believed that one of the most effective means of understanding human nature was to understand the cultural artifacts produced by human beings. Dilthey discussed literature as a significant artifact for study. Motion pictures are analogs to literature. Second, much of contemporary research in the nature of creativity posits that creative products communicate with many members of the society in which they were created, and therefore are considered meaningful to those individuals (Arons & Richards, 1999; Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Montuori & Purser, 1995; Richards, 1999). The determination of products' creativity is based on the judgment and evaluation of content area gatekeepers and by consumers. Would gatekeepers and consumers declare products creative if they fundamentally disagreed with the values underlying that product? Perhaps, but they are more likely to laud products they enjoy and whose underlying values they agree with or at least appreciate. Given the importance of motion pictures as cultural artifacts and creative product linking creators and audience members, the findings in this study are relevant because they reveal much about personal and societal values.

The hierarchies of personal values determined by this study are clear, but do they make sense? Are the personal goal values of family security, self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, and true friendship, as well as, to lesser degrees, mature love, inner harmony, and national security, reflective of the most important end-state goals in American society? These values resonate clearly an intuitive sense of what is important in America society. Granted, these values are not the only ones to do so, but they are goals that are clearly manifested and sought after in this society.

While there was some variation in the top six goal values among the three film samples, it is important to note that the top six behavior values were the same, if slightly reordered, in all three samples. The six values common to all three

samples, in alphabetical order, were being ambitious, capable, courageous, helpful, loving, and responsible. Although the findings related to behavior values were highly uniform, how well do they relate to what is known about American society? Do these values represent what Americans believe about how one should behave in personal relationships and society? Phrased another way, are there Americans who would say that people should behave in ways that are *not* ambitious, capable, courageous, helpful, loving, and responsible? It is highly unlikely, although being ambitious can be a problem if it leads to greed and exclusive self-interest. However, as a part of an interrelated top-tier value hierarchy, the combination of these values appears to be aligned with what this culture puts forth as how people should behave in it.

The overlap of instrumental values across the three samples was greater than that found in terminal values. This is not surprising. In a pluralistic, heterogeneous society like the United States, it is much easier for people to reach consensus on *how* members of society should *behave* rather than *what* they should *achieve*. Goals to be achieved are personal decisions; the manner in which people behave is social and interrelated with other members of society.

The mutability of personal value hierarchies was explored in response to the second research question, in particular how personal values might change when protagonists were confronted by challenging circumstances. Analysis of these findings led to five key determinations. First, there was a sizeable core of immutable values consistently important to the protagonists from beginning to end in the films. Second, some of the values held important at the beginning of the films were not important at the end of them. Third, some values of little importance at the beginning of the films rose to great importance by the end of them. Fourth, the values that changed from beginning to end, when combined with the core unchanging values, suggested a shift from self-orientation to orientation toward other people. Fifth, the value shifts demonstrated some parallels to movement up the levels of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1954).

Rokeach (1973), Feather (1975), and Williams (1968, 1979) anticipated mutable value hierarchies when they described the need for and desirability of flexible rankings in order to accommodate changing life circumstances. As Williams (1979) pointed out, "people are not distinguished by whether or not they have values, but by how they organize and prioritize them" (p. 17). Earlier, Williams (1968) had noted that

It would be a rare and limiting case if and when a person's behavior is guided over a considerable period of time by one and only one value. . . . More often particular acts or sequences of acts are steered by multiple and changing clusters of values. (p. 27)

The changes in protagonists' value hierarchies between the beginning and ending of the films attest to the human ability to meet changes and challenges head on. However, given these changes, the more interesting finding was that most of the values determined to be of greatest importance at the beginning remained that way to the end. The fact that the majority of important values did not change supported the concept of relatively stable value hierarchies with allowance for some change necessary for adaptation to life's exigencies. Further, it appears that it was the larger, stable core of immutable values that made possible the changes in peripheral values from beginning to end. That core provided the strong infrastructure that made change and growth possible without disorientation to the protagonists.

Given these stable core values and shifting peripheral ones, what can be said about the changes that took place? The terminal and instrumental values that fell from importance—a comfortable life, an exciting life, freedom, happiness, social recognition, and being an imaginative or independent person—tended to have intrapersonal focuses leading to the characters being self-oriented, materialistic, or hedonistic at the beginning of the films. By the end of the films, the values that rose to prominence, mature love, true friendship, and being a loving person, combined with the stable core values, led to the characters demonstrating stronger interpersonal focuses based on altruism, social insight, understanding, and transcendent relationships. In other words, the core values of great importance to the protagonist remained stable; changes in values from beginning to end of the movies signaled the shift from focus on oneself to focus on others and their well being.

Further examination of the changes in the peripheral values and the unchanging core suggested Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1954). When the value hierarchies from the beginning of the films were placed on a chart with Maslow's levels of needs, the strongest parallels related to personal safety, self-esteem, and positive recognition by other people. (See Table 13.) However, by the end of the movies, the changes in hierarchies revealed the strongest parallels to be with Maslow's levels of love, belonging, and social interaction, suggesting that value shifts taking place went from intrapersonal to interpersonal. (See Table 14.) The protagonists met challenges, they struggled to overcome them, and in the process they learned about the value of their relationships with other people. As a result, they changed and grew to become people with greater interpersonal and humanistic orientations.

Table 13. Beginning Rokeach Values and Maslow's Hierachy of Needs.

Beginning Rokeach	Maslow Hierarchy
Independent	Being values (self-sufficiency) (6)
Honest	Being values (honesty) (6)
Imaginative	Cognitive needs (5)
Social recognition	Esteem needs (4)
Sense of accomplishment	Esteem needs (4)
Self-respect	Esteem needs (4)
Ambitious	Safety needs (2)
Helpful	Safety needs (2)
Comfortable life	Safety needs (2)
World at peace	Safety needs (2)
Family security	Safety needs (2)
Self-controlled	Safety needs (2)
Capable	Safety needs (2)
Courageous	Safety needs (2)
Responsible	Safety needs (2)
Exciting life	No match (0)
Freedom	No match (0)
Happiness	No match (0)

Note: Numbers indicate rank in the Hierarchy of Needs: (6) = being and self-actualization values, (5) = cognitive, (4) = esteem, (3) = love/belonging/social, (2) = safety, (1) = physiological, and (0) = no match.

Table 14. End Rokeach Values and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs.

End Rokeach	Maslow Hierarchy
Inner harmony	Being values (wholeness) (6)
Wisdom	Being values (wholeness) (6)
Sense of accomplishment	Esteem needs (4)
Self-respect	Esteem needs (4)
Mature love	Love/belonging/social needs (3)
True friendship	Love/belonging/social needs (3)
Loving	Love/belonging/social needs (3)
Ambitious	Safety needs (2)
Helpful	Safety needs (2)
Family security	Safety needs (2)
National security	Safety needs (2)
Capable	Safety needs (2)
Courageous	Safety needs (2)
Responsible	Safety needs (2)

Note: Numbers indicate rank in the Hierarchy of Needs: (6) = being and self-actualization values, (5) = cognitive, (4) = esteem, (3) = love/belonging/social, (2) = safety, (1) = physiological, and (0) = no match.

As for the discovery of the similarities in value hierarchies among the three samples, this should not have come as a surprise. The similarities most likely derived from the fact that all of these films were created to entertain the same type of mass media audiences. While there were differences in production budgets among the films, all of them came from the same pool of mainstream, mass-marketed films whose overriding purpose was commercial success rather than awards for creativity. Most of the films were advertised to the same pool of potential viewers and distributed in the same easily accessible mainstream theaters. To use a metaphor, all 93 films were siblings and cousins of the same extended family. Consequently, it makes sense that their protagonists believed in and were motivated by very similar values.

LIMITATIONS

The samples of films chosen for this study must be considered the greatest obstacles to application of these findings to other research contexts. The value hierarchies may have been different if the protagonists had been of a different gender, ethnicity, age, and socioeconomic status. The films came from preexisting categories of films released in the United States from 1996 through 2005. Historical events happening during that time period, such as the fall of the World Trade Center Towers on September 11, 2001, may have impacted the value portrayed in the films after the events took place. Further, all films were created for distribution in the United States. Analysis of personal values of protagonists in films not made for mainstream commercial distribution in the U.S. may reveal different hierarchies of values.

FURTHER RESEARCH

Given the value hierarchies determined by this study, it would be useful to survey segments of society to compare and contrast the value hierarchies of

real people with those of the film protagonists. Similarities and differences found between the two populations—actual members of society and fictional film characters—would cast the findings of this study in a new light as well as suggest insights into contemporary American society.

In general, many more films need to be coded to provide depth and longitude to the developing database of values held by film protagonists and the demographics of the protagonists. Further, with a more expansive database, research could focus on comparative study of values held by protagonists in various time periods, for example, 25-year intervals to analyze key films from 1951, 1976, and 2001. The purpose of this type of study would be to determine core, immutable values that have been sustained over a specific time period and to discover the mutable values that have risen and fallen in prominence during the same time span. This type of longitudinal study could provide insight into the cultural evolution of cinematic and societal values over time.

The study discussed in this article focused on better understanding personal values of protagonists in commercial feature films. However, the methodology of content analysis utilized in the study could just as efficiently be applied to research personal values perceived in other forms of visual media. For example, a study of the personal values enacted in television commercials would be useful to determine the gap, if any, between the values advertisers intended to draw upon contrasted with value actually perceived by viewers. This research would be useful in analyzing the effectiveness of advertising efforts to reach targeted customers.

CONCLUSION

The findings in this study are important because they present the 93 films in a new light. They do not make those films better or worse; instead, these findings make the films more interesting, because they contribute to a better understanding of the infrastructure of personal values upon which characters were created and stories were told.

At a time in world history when religious and political demagogues would have society believe that they have special insights into the personal values all people should share, it was necessary to determine, as objectively as possible, the key values that were actually influential in American popular culture, not the values that religion and politics would foist upon society. This study made those determinations through disciplined inquiry that was empirical, reproducible, and objective. As a result, this study contributes to better understanding the complex hierarchies of personal values held to be important in the U.S.

Popular culture is in many ways based on entertainment. Movies play a substantial role in determining the nature of current popular culture. Award-winning films help define cinematic aesthetics. Blockbuster films are multimillion-dollar industries impacting the economic landscape in many parts of the U.S. Nonetheless, prior to this study, little analysis has been done to determine what these pillars of popular culture reveal about the personal values of people represented in films. This study is a step in the direction of bolstering that field of research.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G., Vernon, P., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *A study of values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Arons, M., & Richards, R. (1999). Two noble insurgencies: Creativity and humanistic psychology. In K. J. Schneider, J. Bugental, & J. Pierson (Eds.), *The handbook of humanistic psychology* (pp. 127–142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bay, M. (Director). (1998). *Armageddon* [motion picture]. United States: Touchstone Pictures.
- Beckwith, D. (2007). *Personal values of protagonists in best pictures and blockbusters 1996–2005*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, San Francisco.
- Benigni, R. (Director). (1998). *Life is beautiful* [motion picture]. Italy: Cecchi Gori Group.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Hafner.
- Bird, B. (Director). (2004). *The Incredibles* [motion picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.
- Box Office Mojo. (2006). *Yearly box office*. Retrieved February 1, 2006, from <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/yearly/>.
- Buyer Behavior. (2006). In *Collins dictionary of business*. London: Collins. Retrieved August 21, 2008, from <http://www.credoreference.com/entry/5922074>.
- Cameron, J. (Director). (1997). *Titanic* [motion picture]. United States: 20th Century Fox.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). Implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 313–335). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuaron, A. (Director). (2004). *Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban* [motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- DePalma, B. (Director). (1996). *Mission: Impossible* [motion picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.
- Dilthey, W. (1985). The understanding of other persons and their life-expressions. K. Mueller-Vollmer, Trans. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.), *The hermeneutics reader*. New York: Continuum.
- Eastwood, C. (Director). (2004). *Million dollar baby* [motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Feather, N. (1975). *Values in education and society*. New York: Free Press.
- Global Movies & Entertainment: Industry Profile. (2005). New York: Datamonitor USA.
- Hackford, T. (Director). (2004). *Ray* [motion picture]. United States: Bristol Bay Productions.
- Haggis, P. (Director). (2005). *Crash* [motion picture]. United States: Bull's Eye Entertainment.
- Hall, E. (1989). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hanson, C. (Director). (1997). *L.A. confidential* [motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and the humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Howard, R. (Director). (2001). *A beautiful mind* [motion picture]. United States: DreamWorks SKG and Imagine Entertainment.
- Jackson, P. (Director). (2001). *The lord of the rings: The fellowship of the ring* [motion picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Jackson, P. (Director). (2002). *The lord of the rings: The two towers* [motion picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Jackson, P. (Director). (2003). *The lord of the rings: The return of the king* [motion picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Kapur, R. (Director). (1998). *Elizabeth* [motion picture]. Great Britain: Channel Four Films.

- Kerlinger, F. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 65–77). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kluckhohn, R., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variation in values orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson & Co.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lasseter, J., Unkrich, L., & Brannon, A. (Directors). (1999). *Toy story 2* [motion picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.
- Lewis, R., & Chambers, R. E. (2000). *Marketing leadership in hospitality: Foundations and practice*, 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley & Son.
- Mann, M. (Director). (1999). *The insider* [motion picture]. United States: Touchstone Pictures.
- Marketing. (2005). In *International encyclopedia of hospitality management*. Oxford: Elsevier Science & Technology, Retrieved August 20, 2008, from <http://www.credo-reference.com/entry/7912726/>.
- Marketing. (2006). In *Dictionary of business*. London: A&C Black. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from <http://credoreference.com/entry/7682694/>.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- Mendes, S. (Director). (1999). *American beauty* [motion picture]. United States: DreamWorks SKG.
- Meyers, N. (Director). (2000). *What women want* [motion picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.
- Montuori, A., & Purser, R. (1995). Deconstructing the lone genius myth: Toward a contextual view of creativity. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 35, 69–112.
- Motion Picture Association of America. (2007). *What do the rating mean?* Retrieved January 3, 2007, from http://www.mpa.org/FilmRat_Ratings.asp.
- Neuendorf, K. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Newell, M. (Director). (2005). *Harry Potter and the goblet of fire* [motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Payne, A. (Director). (2004). *Sideways* [motion picture]. United States: Fox Searchlight Pictures.
- Raimi, S. (Director). (2002). *Spider-man* [motion picture]. United States: Columbia Pictures.
- Richards, R. (1999). The four p's of creativity. In M. Runco & S. Pritzker (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of creativity*, Vol. 1 (pp. 733–742). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. (1998). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Collier Macmillan.
- Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal*. New York: The Free Press.
- Scorsese, M. (Director). (2004). *The aviator* [motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Scott, R. (Director). (2000). *Gladiator* [motion picture]. United States: DreamWorks SKG.
- Soderbergh, S. (Director). (2000a). *Erin Brockovich* [motion picture]. United States: Universal Pictures.
- Soderbergh, S. (Director). (2000b). *Traffic* [motion picture]. United States: USA Films.
- Soderbergh, S. (Director). (2001). *Ocean's 11* [motion picture]. United States: Village Roadshow Pictures.
- Spielberg, S. (Director). (1998). *Saving Private Ryan* [motion picture]. United States: Amblin Entertainment.

- Stanton, A. (Director). (2003). *Finding Nemo* [motion picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in global business*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wachowski, A., & Wachowski, L. (Directors). (2003). *The matrix reloaded* [motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Weber, R. (1990). *Basic content analysis*, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Williams, R. (1968). Values. In E. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 82–96). New York: Macmillan.
- Williams, R. (1979). Change and stability in values and value systems: A sociological perspective. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal* (pp. 15–46). New York: Free Press.
- Zondag, R., & Leighton, E. (Directors). (2000). *Dinosaur* [motion picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.

This work derives from the 2007 Ph.D. dissertation titled *Personal Values of Protagonists in Best Pictures and Blockbusters 1996–2005* written by the author of the article.

Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to: Douglas C. Beckwith, Dean of Axia College, University of Phoenix, 4605 East Elwood Street, Mail Stop AAC701, Phoenix, AZ 85040 (Douglas.Beckwith@phoenix.edu).

APPENDIX A

Films Arranged by Year

Year	Academy Awards for Best Picture and Nominees	Top Box Office Receipts ⁺ for the Year, in Order of Earnings	Films, Both Best Pictures and Blockbusters
1996	<i>The English Patient</i> * (Minghella, 1996) <i>Fargo</i> (Coen, 1996) <i>Jerry Maguire</i> (Crowe, 1996) <i>Secrets and Lies</i> (Leigh, 1996) <i>Shine</i> (Hicks, 1996)	<i>Independence Day</i> (Emmerich, 1996) <i>Twister</i> (De Bont, 1996) <i>Mission: Impossible</i> (DePalma, 1996) <i>The Rock</i> (Bay, 1996) <i>The Hunchback of Notre Dame</i> (Wise & Trousdale, 1996)	
1997	<i>Titanic</i> * (Cameron, 1997) <i>As Good as It Gets</i> (Brooks, 1997) <i>The Full Monty</i> (Cattaneo, 1996) <i>Good Will Hunting</i> (Van Sant, 1997) <i>L.A. Confidential</i> (Hanson, 1997)	<i>Titanic</i> <i>The Lost World: Jurassic Park</i> (Spielberg, 1997) <i>Men in Black</i> (Sonnenfeld, 1997) <i>Tomorrow Never Dies</i> (Spottiswoode, 1997) <i>Air Force One</i> (Petersen, 1997)	<i>Titanic</i>
1998	<i>Shakespeare in Love</i> * (Madden, 1998) <i>Elizabeth</i> (Kapur, 1998) <i>Life Is Beautiful</i> (Benigni, 1998) <i>Saving Private Ryan</i> <i>The Thin Red Line</i> (Malick, 1998)	<i>Armageddon</i> (Bay, 1998) <i>Saving Private Ryan</i> (Spielberg, 1998) <i>Godzilla</i> (Emmerich, 1998) <i>There's Something about Mary</i> (Farrelly & Farrelly, 1998) <i>A Bug's Life</i> (Lasseter & Stanton, 1998)	<i>Saving Private Ryan</i>
1999	<i>American Beauty</i> * (Mendes, 1999) <i>The Cider House Rules</i> (Hallstrom, 1999) <i>The Green Mile</i> (Durabont, 1999) <i>The Insider</i> (Mann, 1999) <i>The Sixth Sense</i>	<i>Star Wars: Episode I: The Phantom Menace</i> (Lucas, 1999) <i>The Sixth Sense</i> (Shyamalan, 1999) <i>Toy Story 2</i> (Lasseter, Unkrich, & Bannon, 1999) <i>The Matrix</i> (Wachowski & Wachowski, 1999) <i>Tarzan</i> (Lima & Buck, 1999)	<i>The Sixth Sense</i>
2000	<i>Gladiator</i> * (Scott, 2000) <i>Chocolat</i> (Hallstrom, 2000)	<i>Mission: Impossible II</i> (Woo, 2000) <i>Gladiator</i>	<i>Gladiator</i>

APPENDIX A (Continued)

	<i>Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon</i> (Lee, 2000)	<i>Cast Away</i> (Zemeckis, 2000)	
	<i>Erin Brockovich</i> (Soderbergh, 2000)	<i>What Women Want</i> (Meyers, 2000)	
	<i>Traffic</i> (Soderbergh, 2000)	<i>Dinosaur</i> (Zondag & Leighton, 2000)	
2001	<i>A Beautiful Mind*</i> (Howard, 2001)	<i>Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone</i> (Columbus, 2001)	
	<i>Gosford Park</i> (Altman, 2001)	<i>The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring</i> (Jackson, 2003)	<i>The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring</i>
	<i>In the Bedroom</i> (Field, 2001)	<i>Monsters, Inc.</i> (Docter, 2001)	
	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring</i>	<i>Shrek</i> (Adamson & Jenson, 2001)	
	<i>Moulin Rouge</i> (Luhmann, 2001)	<i>Ocean's Eleven</i> (Soderbergh, 2001)	
2002	<i>Chicago*</i> (Marshall, 2002)	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers</i> (Jackson, 2002)	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers</i>
	<i>Gangs of New York</i> (Scorsese, 2002)	<i>Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets</i> (Columbus, 2002)	
	<i>The Hours</i> (Daldry, 2002)	<i>Spider-Man</i> (Raimi, 2002)	
	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers</i>	<i>Star Wars: Episode II: Attack of the Clones</i> (Lucas, 2002)	
	<i>The Pianist</i> (Polanski, 2002)	<i>Men in Black II</i> (Sonnenfeld, 2002)	
2003	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King*</i> (Jackson, 2003)	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King</i> (Jackson, 2003)	<i>Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King</i>
	<i>Lost in Translation</i> (Coppola, 2003)	<i>Finding Nemo</i> (Stanton, 2003)	
	<i>Master and Commander: The Far Side of the World</i> (Weir, 2003)	<i>The Matrix Reloaded</i> (Wachowski & Wachowski, 2003)	
	<i>Mystic River</i> (Eastwood, 2003)	<i>Pirates of the Caribbean: The Curse of the Black Pearl</i> (Verbinski, 2003)	
	<i>Seabiscuit</i> (Ross, 2003)	<i>Bruce Almighty</i> (Shadyac, 2003)	
2004	<i>Million Dollar Baby*</i> (Eastwood, 2004)	<i>Shrek 2</i> (Adamson & Ashbury, 2004)	
	<i>The Aviator</i> (Scorsese, 2004)	<i>Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban</i> (Cuaron, 2004)	
	<i>Finding Neverland</i> (Forster, 2004)	<i>Spider-Man 2</i> (Raimi, 2004)	
	<i>Ray</i> (Hackford, 2004)	<i>The Incredibles</i> (Bird, 2004)	
	<i>Sideways</i> (Payne, 2004)	<i>The Passion of the Christ</i> (Gibson, 2004)	

(Continued)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

2005	<i>Crash</i> * (Haggis, 2005)	<i>Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire</i> (Newell, 2005)
	<i>Brokeback Mountain</i> (Lee, 2005)	<i>Star Wars: Episode III: The Revenge of the Sith</i> (Lucas, 2005)
	<i>Capote</i> (Miller, 2005)	<i>The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe</i> (Adamson, 2005)
	<i>Good Night, and Good Luck</i> (Clooney, 2005)	<i>War of the Worlds</i> (Spielberg, 2005)
	<i>Munich</i> (Spielberg, 2005)	<i>King Kong</i> (Jackson, 2005)

Note: *Best Picture winner; + combined domestic and international.

APPENDIX B

Worldwide Gross Revenues for Blockbuster Films: 1996–2005

Rank	Title	Studio*	Worldwide	Domestic/%	Overseas/%
1996 WORLDWIDE GROSSES					
1	<i>Independence Day</i>	Fox	\$817.0	\$306.2 37.5%	\$510.8 62.5%
2	<i>Twister</i>	WB	\$494.5	\$241.7 48.9%	\$252.8 51.1%
3	<i>Mission: Impossible</i>	Par.	\$456.5	\$181.0 39.6%	\$275.5 60.4%
4	<i>The Rock</i>	BV	\$335.1	\$134.1 40.0%	\$201.0 60.0%
5	<i>The Hunchback of Notre Dame</i>	BV	\$325.3	\$100.1 30.8%	\$225.2 69.2%
1997 WORLDWIDE GROSSES					
1	<i>Titanic</i>	Par.	\$1,845.0	\$600.8 32.6%	\$1244.2 67.4%
2	<i>The Lost World: Jurassic Park</i>	Uni.	\$618.6	\$229.1 37.0%	\$389.6 63.0%
3	<i>Men in Black</i>	Sony	\$589.4	\$250.7 42.5%	\$338.7 57.5%
4	<i>Tomorrow Never Dies</i>	MGM	\$339.3	\$125.3 36.9%	\$214.0 63.1%
5	<i>Air Force One</i>	Sony	\$315.2	\$173.0 54.9%	\$142.2 45.1%
1998 WORLDWIDE GROSSES					
1	<i>Armageddon</i>	BV	\$553.7	\$201.6 36.4%	\$352.1 63.6%
2	<i>Saving Private Ryan</i>	DW	\$481.8	\$216.5 44.9%	\$265.3 55.1%
3	<i>Godzilla</i>	Sony	\$379.0	\$136.3 36.0%	\$242.7 64.0%
4	<i>There's Something about Mary</i>	Fox	\$369.9	\$176.5 47.7%	\$193.4 52.3%
5	<i>A Bug's Life</i>	BV	\$363.4	\$162.8 44.8%	\$200.6 55.2%
1999 WORLDWIDE GROSSES					
1	<i>Star Wars: Episode I: The Phantom Menace</i>	Fox	\$924.3	\$431.1 46.6%	\$493.2 53.4%
2	<i>The Sixth Sense</i>	BV	\$672.8	\$293.5 43.6%	\$379.3 56.4%
3	<i>Toy Story 2</i>	BV	\$485.0	\$245.9 50.7%	\$239.2 49.3%
4	<i>The Matrix</i>	WB	\$460.4	\$171.5 37.2%	\$288.9 62.8%
5	<i>Tarzan</i>	BV	\$448.2	\$171.1 38.2%	\$277.1 61.8%
2000 WORLDWIDE GROSSES					
1	<i>Mission: Impossible II</i>	Par.	\$545.9	\$215.4 39.5%	\$330.5 60.5%
2	<i>Gladiator</i>	DW	\$457.6	\$187.7 41.0%	\$269.9 59.0%
3	<i>Cast Away</i>	Fox	\$429.6	\$233.6 54.4%	\$196.0 45.6%
4	<i>What Women Want</i>	Par.	\$374.1	\$182.8 48.9%	\$191.3 51.1%
5	<i>Dinosaur</i>	BV	\$354.2	\$137.7 38.9%	\$216.5 61.1%

APPENDIX B (Continued)

2001 WORLDWIDE GROSSES

1	<i>Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone</i>	WB	\$976.5	\$317.6	32.5%	\$658.9	67.5%
2	<i>The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring</i>	NL	\$870.0	\$313.4	36.0%	\$556.6	64.0%
3	<i>Monsters, Inc.</i>	BV	\$525.4	\$255.9	48.7%	\$269.5	51.3%
4	<i>Shrek</i>	DW	\$484.4	\$267.7	55.3%	\$216.7	44.7%
5	<i>Ocean's Eleven</i>	WB	\$450.7	\$183.4	40.7%	\$267.3	59.3%

2002 WORLDWIDE GROSSES

1	<i>The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers</i>	NL	\$924.3	\$339.8	36.8%	\$584.5	63.2%
2	<i>Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets</i>	WB	\$876.7	\$262.0	29.9%	\$614.7	70.1%
3	<i>Spider-Man</i>	Sony	\$821.7	\$403.7	49.1%	\$418.0	50.9%
4	<i>Star Wars: Episode II: Attack of the Clones</i>	Fox	\$640.9	\$302.2	47.2%	\$338.7	52.8%
5	<i>Men in Black II</i>	Sony	\$441.8	\$190.4	43.1%	\$251.4	56.9%

2003 WORLDWIDE GROSSES

1	<i>The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King</i>	NL	\$1118.9	\$377.0	33.7%	\$741.9	66.3%
2	<i>Finding Nemo</i>	BV	\$864.6	\$339.7	39.3%	\$524.9	60.7%
3	<i>The Matrix Reloaded</i>	WB	\$738.6	\$281.6	38.1%	\$457.0	61.9%
4	<i>Pirates of the Caribbean: The Curse of the Black Pearl</i>	BV	\$653.9	\$305.4	46.7%	\$348.5	53.3%
5	<i>Bruce Almighty</i>	Uni.	\$484.6	\$242.8	50.1%	\$241.7	49.9%

2004 WORLDWIDE GROSSES

1	<i>Shrek 2</i>	DW	\$920.7	\$441.2	47.9%	\$479.4	52.1%
2	<i>Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban</i>	WB	\$789.8	\$249.5	31.6%	\$540.3	68.4%
3	<i>Spider-Man 2</i>	Sony	\$783.8	\$373.6	47.7%	\$410.2	52.3%
4	<i>The Incredibles</i>	BV	\$631.4	\$261.4	41.4%	\$370.0	58.6%
5	<i>The Passion of the Christ</i>	NM	\$611.4	\$370.3	60.6%	\$241.1	39.4%

2005 WORLDWIDE GROSSES

1	<i>Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire</i>	WB	\$892.2	\$290.0	32.5%	\$602.2	67.5%
2	<i>Star Wars: Episode III: Revenge of the Sith</i>	Fox	\$848.8	\$380.3	44.8%	\$468.5	55.2%
3	<i>The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe</i>	BV	\$737.0	\$291.7	39.6%	\$445.3	60.4%
4	<i>War of the Worlds</i>	Par.	\$591.4	\$234.3	39.6%	\$357.1	60.4%
5	<i>King Kong</i>	Uni.	\$547.3	\$218.1	39.8%	\$329.2	60.2%

Note: Retrieved on April 22, 2006, from <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/yearly/>.