Instead of banning adult content in movies, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) gives ratings to let viewers know what occurs in a movie. The interactions between a movie's creators and the MPAA can be complex. For example, if a movie's creators are unhappy with a rating, they can edit and resubmit their movie to the MPAA until they get the rating they want. Critics of the current system point out that it seems to restrict curse words more than violence. For example, a PG-13 movie is usually only allowed one major curse word. With more than one swear word, it would likely be bumped up to an R rating. But that same movie could contain multiple instances of graphic violence, including shootings and stabbings, and still keep its PG-13 rating.

Option 1: According to the table, which of the following is true?

A. If a movie is rated PG-13, it will definitely earn more money than a movie rated R.
B. On average, movies rated PG-13 earned more money than movies rated PG.
C. On average, movies rated R earned more money than PG-rated movies.
D. Movies that were not rated did not earn any money.

Option 2: If these average earnings applied to an individual movie, how much would it be worth to a movie's creators to have a rating changed from R to PG-13?

Discussion Question: Over a decade later, average earnings per film still follow the same trend. In general, a movie with a PG-13 rating will earn much more than a movie with an R rating. Why? Here is one possible explanation: For some parents, watching movies is a way to interact with their kids. They see a movie together, and then talk about it afterwards. This helps parents and kids build strong relationships. Therefore, R-rated movies may earn less money because parents don't take their kids to see them. Is this a good explanation, or do you think the situation is more complex?