


☐

I'm not robot


reCAPTCHA

Continue

Invictus movie questions and answers

Photo: WikiCommons by Otto Godfrey and Justin Morton Cars and Movies are going well together, as is evident in the many memorable cars we've seen on the silver screen, then and now. Do you want to drive one? Even in your dreams? Why not! Let's see if we can find out which car suits your personality by answering the questions we post here. Come on, it's going to be a fun trip! Imagine going to the streets as a hero or opponent of your choice. Are you the bad guy chasing the good guys? Or are you the good guy the bad guys are chasing? No matter who you are in the movie inside your mind, let's match it up to the car of your temporary cinematic dreams! Hollywood has a lot to offer when it comes to cars. In movie sets, they call these cars photo vehicles because they will be seen on camera, to be driven by a character. Of course, we already know now that the character is also defined by what he has in his film life. And yes, that also means the kind of car that the screen character has. It is a sign of their behaviour and actions. It's an extension of their character, so, based on some interesting questions, we can figure out which movie car you're driving in? Let's take a look! Personality can guess your favorite muscle car? 5 min quiz 5-minute TRIVIA match the character of the movie to the car they drove! 7 minute quiz 7 minutes TRIVIA can you match the car to the movie character? 7 min trivia 7-minute quiz can you match the movie car to star? 7 minute personal 7 minute contest can us guess what kind of car you're getting your kid? 5 minute quiz 5 minutes TRIVIA can you select these cars you see in the '50s drive in? 7 minute contest 7 minutes personal what a beautiful '60s car matches your personality? 5 min personal 5 minute contest if you are a car, what type would it be? 5 min quiz 5 minutes TRIVIA ultimate car engine contest 6 minutes contest 6 minutes How do you know about dinosaurs? What is the octane classification? And how do you use a proper name? Luckily for you, HowStuffWorks is playing here to help. Our award-winning website offers reliable and easy-to-understand explanations of how the world works. From fun quizzes that bring joy to your day, to compelling photography and great menus, HowStuffWorks Play offers something for everyone. Sometimes we explain how things work, other times, we ask you, but we always explore in the name of pleasure! Because learning is fun, so stick with us! Play tests are free! We send trivia questions and personality tests every week to your inbox. By clicking on the registration you agree to our privacy policy and confirm that you are 13 years of age or older. Copyright © 2020 InfoSpace Holdings, LLC, a System1 company that credit union updates its banking website online, so experimental fish with accounts there are updates Her family's accounts. The new feature was security questions. I didn't like the three who gave, so I went down to see more questions. I chose my three new questions and wrote the answers so the husband would know what they were. But the first time he tries, he blows up the password. Fish must go through the whole process of resetting the account. The next time he tries, the fish must go through the whole process again - but this time you print screenshots of the questions you have chosen, and write the answers to them. To make sure it doesn't happen a third time, the fish walks him through the login process. But when they come to the issue of security, the question that arises is not one of the new questions chosen by the fish. I deliberately chose questions I knew he could answer. I've overtaken the question about what I was graduating from high school, but there was, waiting for an answer. In my last attempt at a three-attempt scenario or you locked. I remembered that this is the first question of their three original options. So I gave the answer I used to the first question, where were you born? Bingo, you're in. That's ridiculous. It puts in a call to the same customer service representative who has already reset the password for the account twice. A delegate tells fish that a large group of people are getting locked up on security questions. Can I talk to the programmer? Asking the fish. I can't move you, says a rep. Well, write this down and give it to it, Fish says. Tell them that while they allow users to choose new questions, they're recording the answers but keeping the original default questions as first submitted. I also asked where Fatwani would be sent for problem-solving consultations, but I did not hear from her. But now we have a way to make security questions unanswerable by hackers. For example, for the question where were you born? We are the key in the year of the account holder's birth as an answer. Answer a sharecall call for true tales of IT life! Send me your stories in sharky@computerworld.com you'll have a stylish shark shirt every time I use a shirt. Comment on today's tale in the Sharky+ Google community, read thousands of great old tales in Sharkives. Get the daily dose from outside takes from the IT scene of tinkering delivered directly to your inbox. Sign up now for our daily shark newsletter. Copyright © 2017 IDG Communications, Inc. in an in-depth interview, we asked Collins about the implications of his research and ideas on the economy, the stock market and the nature of executive leadership. Good to great companies have achieved what I have written about all the great stock market results over a 15-year period. But today, the stock market has fallen. Does that mean we won't see any good companies to great today? First, I want to correct a major misunderstanding. The stock market is not down. What does the stock market look like for 1985? The stock market has not fallen. What's it like for 1990? The stock market has not fallen. The market was irrationally whacked - we didn't have a stock market; The technology bubble has not been the new economy, a new economy has been going on for years on a deeper level. But the brutal truth is that companies that were at the top of the technology bubble had no results. You can't make zero profits and claim that you have results. In the case of companies that achieved great results before the bubble burst, they are in the hade period now, but what about that? The bottom line on a company like Cisco is, we don't know the answer yet. Those companies can only be in a very difficult period of 6 to 12 months. Let me use the analogy to assume that you have a big basketball strain like UCLA Bruins under John Wooden. This is the team that will win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. They are a team that went from good to great but in 1970, they lost three games. Does that mean we're going to write them off and say they're not a great team? We have to look over a longer period of time. The same applies to companies that have been caught in a bubble. It was a very short time and it would take more time to find out which companies are facing problems now and that are simply going through a momentary period and will have the flexibility to return. But for many businesspeople, the current slowdown is a sign of the demise of the new economy. This is one of the coolest times in history. Two or three years ago, what major complaint did we hear? It's very hard to get good people! I'm sorry, I'm sorry! Today, we have the greatest opportunity for decades to stumble upon the boat load -- not a bus, but a boat load -- of great people. Great companies always start with who, not what. We can finally get to the right side of the Packard Act. It argues that no company can become or remain large if it allows its revenue growth rate to exceed its growth in accessing the right people in a sustainable manner. It is one of those timeless truths that transcends technology and the economy. Now, instead of trying to accumulate capital, we can accumulate people. If I were running a company today, I would have one priority above all: getting as many of the best people as possible. I've been putting it off everything else if I can afford it - new buildings, projects, r&d - to fill my bus. Because things are coming back, he's about to start turning. The biggest obstacle to growth and the success of my institution is not markets, not technology, not opportunity, not stock market. If you To be a big company, reducing the biggest one on your ability to grow is the ability to get and hold on enough of the right people. This is also a great time to force yourself to look back. When you were breaking the Packard Act, you probably left a lot of people wrong on the bus. This is the time to take them out. In fact, it's a little easier to do it now. We can blame that for the circumstances. What else will you do to take advantage of this revaluation period? This is also a great time to ask yourself some really hard questions. In a time of irrational prosperity, where the market will give you money whether you hand over or not, many companies have not answered any of the questions in the three circles (what can we be the best in the world? What economic place drives our economic engine at the best level? And what are our core people deeply passionate about?). They didn't have a concept of what they could do better than any other company in the world was sustainable, they didn't have a profit, and the only thing they had a passion for was flipping the company. Now we can't live in that imaginary land we have to take a closer look at all the things we do and put them all in the three-circle test. Any things that fail in the test we have to stop doing - today, I see a lot of companies that have found themselves with a lot of capital. So they wandered into all sorts of acquisitions, new projects or new trends, simply because they could. But they did not necessarily fit within the three circles. Today, the task for them is to trim away. Those who explain their three circles will come out of this just fine. Those who do not deserve to die today find themselves with little time to prove their worth. What advice will you give the CEO on the hot seat? If you're a hot seat CEO taking over a company that I wanted to go from good to great, here's what you're doing. I was going to take this good chart to the great, and I was putting it in front of my manager. I would say, we are on the left side of this curve. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Right? If that's what we all want, we know what it's going to take to get it. You can't keep reeling from CEO to CEO. If you do, you'll find yourself in the cycle of death - and then you'll end up as one of the comparison companies, not one of the great companies. I don't think all directors are stupid, most of them smart, but they work because of ignorance rather than lack of good intentions. We need to hit them on the head with experimental results. Our mission is to overcome the market in a sustainable way over time. We need to think about the share price over a five-year period. We have to start doing all the things it takes to turn that wheel. Finally, if I'm CEO, I want the board to give me Guarantee: No matter how long or short my term as CEO may be, whatever choice as my successor needs to pick up that wheel in the middle of the road and keep pushing in a steady direction. I may only get the wheel at 16 RPMs. But my successor has to take it to 100 RPMs behind him and he has to take it to 500 RPMs, and his successor to 1000 RPMs. We're not going to do Doom Loop. The CEOs who took their companies from good to big were largely unknown - a far cry from the celebrity CEOs we read about. Is this an accident? Or is it cause and effect? I think it's more about cause and effect than just an accident there's something directly related to the absence of celebrities and having good results to great. Didn't? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into one genius with 1000 assistants. It creates a feeling that it's really about the CEO. This leads to all sorts of problems — if the person goes away or if it turns out that the person is not a genius after all. On a deeper level, we found that for leaders to make something great, their ambition must be for the greatness of work and company rather than for themselves. That doesn't mean they don't have egos, that doesn't mean they don't have any subjective needs. This means that at the decision point after the decision point - at critical junctures when a choice would prefer their ego and choice B would favor the company and its work - these leaders choose B. Celebrity CEO, at those same decision points, are more likely to prefer self-preference and ego over the company and work. Like anonymous CEOs, most companies that have made the transition from good to great are undeclared. What does that tell us? The truth is that most people don't work on the most glamorous things in the world. They're doing real work - which means that most of the time they're doing a lot of heck to with just a few points of excitement. Some people put baked bread, some build retail stores. The real work of the economy gets by the people who make cars, who sell real estate, who run grocery stores and banks. So one of the great results of this study is that you can be in a big company and do it in steel, in pharmacies, in grocery stores. It's simply not an issue that if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool. It doesn't matter where you are so no one has the right to complain about his company, his industry, or the kind of work they do - again. Have the 11 companies that made the shift benefited from anonymity? One of the great advantages that these companies have been, nobody cares! Krueger began his transition, and there were 1,000,000,000 nucor started moving, and the transfer of 1,000,000 was not much expected. It can be less than one-off and over-delivery. In fact, if I'm taking over a company and trying to make it go from good to great, I'll tell the vice president of communications that his job is to make the whole world think we've been constantly on the brink of doom. In the course of our study, we have already printed the transcripts of offers made by the CEO of analysts by good companies to great and comparative companies. We've read all these and this amazing good people to the greats always talk about the challenges they face, the programs they build, and the things they're worried about. They go to comparison companies, they constantly develop themselves, sell the future - but they never achieve results. If I'm not CEO, how do good lessons apply to the great for me? Good to great concepts apply to any situation - as long as you can choose the people around you. That's the crucial thing. But basically, we really do - we have a lot of discretion over people in our lives, and people we decided to let on our bus, whether it's in our department at work or in our personal lives. But the main message is: build your country. You can do it. You can start building momentum in something you've got responsibility for. You can build a great department. You can build a great church community. You can take each one of the good ideas to the great and apply them to your own business or your own life. What did your study teach you about business change in general? Is it basically a message to get back to basics? Very rarely do significant changes ever lead to results in a sustainable way. This is one of the really important results of the book. We started with 1435 companies. And 11 companies did it to look at this fact for a moment the fact is that this doesn't happen very often. Why not? Because we don't know what we're doing! Because we don't know what we're doing, we start with all sorts of things that don't work. We end up like a bunch of neanderthals dancing around the campfire chanting in the moon. What I feel strongly is that we need some science to understand what it takes to change things. Is he back in the basics? No, it's forward to understanding. Why is it up to the basics to say that CEOs need to be ambitious for their companies and not for themselves? Why is it up to the basics to do the question of who and the people first and what and where the question is second? Since when is it back to the basics of a company to start with a question like, why are we sucked for 100 years, and what are the brutal facts that we have to face? Why do you go back to the basics to say that stoplists are more important than work lists? And since when did he go back to basics to say that technology is just a accelerator and not a creator Anything? I don't think these concepts are back to basics. Because if they are, we should be able to come back in time and find that people have used those ideas. It wasn't people - that's why there are only 11 out of 1435. So, no, it's not back to basics. It is forward to understanding. What is your assessment of the new economy? We have seen a lot of change, and we have seen a lot of reactions against change. How do you make sense out of it all? The enormous changes that are taking place around us make it the most exciting time in history to be alive. It is truly enjoyable that all these changes -- changes in technology and globalization -- are brutal realities that must be integrated into any decisions you make. People at Walgreens didn't ignore the internet because they were just focusing on the basics. They faced the brutal reality of the Internet and then asked, how does it fit with our three circuits, and how can we use it to rotate on the flight circuit faster? You never ignore changes - you hit them face to face as brutal facts, or you come to them with a great sense of glee and excitement. This change, this new technology opens up a way for you to prevail, to be better as a company. All good companies to great took changes and used them to their advantage, often with great glee. When the new piano came along, Mozart did not hang his music. I didn't say there's this new harpsichord piano is out of the way, so I swept up as a composer! He thought, that's so cool! I can do it out loud with fort piano! This is really neat! He maintained the discipline of writing great music, and at the same time, embraced with great glee and excitement the invention of piano. With all the change around us, we need to be like Mozart. We maintain great discipline about our music, but at the same time, we embrace things that can allow us to make music bigger. Alan M. Webber (aweber@fastcompany.com) is the founder of Fast. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote a face-based article in the March 2000 issue of Quick Company. His new book, Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make a Leap... Others do not, and will be available in October. October.