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INTRODUCTION

This study analyzes trends films have followed in the last five years, 1989 through 1993, and seeks to determine specifically if content is changing. As I have grown up, I have noticed that R-rated movies seem to attract large numbers of viewers, often times young people who want to see what is forbidden. Movies have been a passion of mine for as long as I can remember. I have felt a burden for quality films showing values that focus on the essential good in people, plots that focus on the story, and characterization that allows the viewer to get to know the person. Through this desire for better movies, I noticed that the film industry has recently started releasing more and more films that I would consider quality, wholesome, family-oriented films that have actually done well at the box office. Since values in motion pictures interests me, I chose it as the focus of my research.

I feel this is an important area of study because society cannot afford to continue to concentrate on the low values, violence, sex, and sacrilege it has for too long. Many people, including movie audiences, want to see films that they can relate to. The public is not just enamored with fantasy and horror films. Through my research, I hope to contribute knowledge about which movies are rating the highest as determined by box office receipts and if audiences are voting for a different type of movie fare than what they have been getting in the last several years. I hope to show that attitudes towards what is popular in the movie industry are changing. Also, I wondered what kinds of films audiences want to see, reflected in film ratings and quality as measured by Academy Awards. Do they have any influence on how popular a movie is by audience standards? My focus is on film grosses, ratings, and awards that movies have received in the last five years: 1989-1993.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

SELF-REGULATION/CENSORSHIP

The rating system and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences both came out of the industry's attempts to self-regulate. With fear of government censorship, the film industry decided to regulate itself. Cobbett S. Steinberg says that "internal control has always been preferred to external intervention . . . . Rather than face government regulations or further public criticism that could be financially disastrous, the film industry has invariably handled . . . attacks by trying to take matters into its own hands" (193).

Steinberg explains that when the public wanted film censorship in 1909, the "industry established the National Board of Censorship (later renamed the National Board of Review) to preview films and to provide guidelines for possible necessary changes." Then in 1922, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association was established. They elected a conservative president, Will H. Hays, Postmaster General under President Harding, to try to appease the industry's critics (193).

Hays' office produced two self-regulatory policies, one called Formula and the other Don'ts and Be Carefuls, before adopting the Production Code in 1930. This code did not take great effect among industry people until the Catholic Legion of Decency waged an effective campaign against movie immorality in 1934. Scared of the Legion's threats, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA) which became the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) in 1945, formed the Production Code Administration Office (PCA). This was the first time the MPPDA could "enforce its regulations: if any member studio released a film without the PCA's certificate of approval, that studio would be fined $25,000" (Steinberg 389). The code underwent many changes over the years and by the 1950s it had lost much of its power. By 1966, the code was revised again dividing "approved films into two categories: those for general audiences and those
suggested for mature audiences." This was not legal though, only suggested. In 1968, the MPAA decided to start over and formed the Code of Self-Regulation (Steinberg 390).

**RATING SYSTEM**

The Code of Self-Regulation was the start of the rating system that audiences know today. According to Phil Berardelli, "the MPAA ratings system was established in 1968 [when] pressures for freedom of artistic expression during the '60s created the need to differentiate between traditional attractions and movies intended to appeal to mature audiences" (g01). Steinberg says that the MPAA decided that "any film regardless of its theme or treatment could be made, but it would be subject to one of four ratings: G (all ages admitted; general audiences); M (suggested for mature audiences–adults and mature young children); R (restricted; children under sixteen required an accompanying parent or adult); X (no one under sixteen admitted)." These ratings were to indicate suitability for children, not a film's quality. In 1970, the R and X ratings moved the restricted age to 17, and the M category changed to GP for parental guidance suggested. GP caused confusion and changed again in 1972 to PG. Eventually, the PCA was replaced by the Code and Rating Administration (CARA). By 1977, CARA changed to the Classification and Rating Administration (399-401).

According to Berardelli, in 1984, the PG-13 category was added to the "four-part rating system," specifying parental guidance for children under 13 years of age. "But the ratings system also produced an unintended effect. While it freed movie makers to explore mature themes under the protection of the R, at the other end of the ratings spectrum the slightest use of vulgar language, violence or sex bumped a movie into at least the PG category, and sometimes even into R territory" (g01). Another author says, in 1990 "the X rating was changed to NC-17 or No Children Under 17, in hopes of removing the pornographic connotation of X" (Monush 20A).
Michael Mayor explains further that the primary purpose of ratings is to inform parents of the film’s content (119). The rating system itself deals more with specific content than with the overall theme of the movie. Ratings do not always stop kids from entering restricted films because of lax movie theatre workers and/or parents allowing their children to attend (122-124).

**ACADEMY AWARDS**

Steinberg says that in 1927, “Hollywood’s reputation was . . . suffering.” The film industry at this point founded the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences for this reason:

“To raise the ‘cultural, educational, and scientific standards’ of film. Even the association’s name was calculated to enhance the industry’s status: an ‘academy’ suggested refined activity, and ‘arts and sciences’ were hardly conducive to immorality. The new organization’s title conveniently contained no suggestion of the two things for which Hollywood was best known: mass entertainment and big business” (193).

In the first year of the Academy, there were 36 charter members (Steinberg 193). Through the years the number has grown. By 1980, the number of voting members was up to 3,600 (196). Tim Appelo says, in 1994, 4,755 make up the voting members of the Academy (34). Steinberg brings out that currently all voting for nominations and awards are made by the Academy members (194). The nominations for each category are taken from the separate branches within the Academy which include the acting branch, the editing branch, the writing branch, the directing branch, etc. Each branch decides the nominees within its own group, then all the branches together nominate their five top choices for Best Picture. All Academy members are allowed to vote for the final winners of each category (194).

The Academy is not immune to preferences and bias. Steinberg says “the awards have been repeatedly criticized for having virtually no connection whatsoever to artistic achievement,” and people began complaining back in the late
1920s “that the prizes were given on a political or social rather than artistic basis” (195). Each member of the Academy has his or her favorite. Appelo quotes Angie Dickenson as saying before the 1993 Academy Awards ceremony that she would vote for Holly Hunter twice as Best Actress. Even though their votes are to be secret, many members will voice their opinions if asked. “The Academy doesn’t even give you the voting members’ names. Still, studios manage to find out who belongs, and they barrage the voters with party and screening invitations” in an attempt to get votes for their people or films (34). Each member votes, however, according to what he or she likes or appreciates in the industry. Voting is not based on a specific set of standards but personal choice.

According to Barry Monush, it was at the first board of governors meeting in 1927 that a discussion of what kind of item to award came up. Certificates, scrolls, medals, and plaques were all mentioned until Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer’s executive art director, Cedric Gibbons insisted that the award should be “a figure of dignity and individual character which recipients would be proud to display. During this meeting, Gibbons sketched the statuette’s figure and design. After four years of being called “the statuette,” this thirteen-and-a-half-inch-tall and eight-and-a-half-pound trophy finally got a name. Margaret Herrick, former executive secretary of the Academy, walked into the office for her first day of work. Seeing a copy of the statuette standing on a desk, she said, “He reminds me of my Uncle Oscar.” A newspaper columnist sitting nearby printed in the next day’s paper that “Employees have affectionately dubbed their famous statuette ‘Oscar.’” He has been known as Oscar ever since (25A).

Over the years, the Academy has given out more and more Oscars to filmmakers achieving “bests” in given categories. Winners pledge never to sell one, except back to the Academy. The award is also protected by copyright and produced by one manufacturer, R.S. Owens in Chicago, Ill. who is licensed by the Academy.
The Academy must also give written permission for the trophy to be used or reproduced in any way (Monush 25A).

Oscar is made out of Britannia metal, copper plate, nickel plate, and gold plate, costing $350 (Monush 25A).
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What films were the top grossing films in the last several years and how much money did they make?

2. Can we see any trends in the types of films that are the top money makers?

3. Which films have been bringing in the most money in the last five years: G, PG, PG-13, or R?

4. Are we seeing a trend toward more R-rated films?

5. Does literature show audiences' tastes changing?

6. Do Awards from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences correlate with top-grossing films?

7. Are moviegoers' tastes changing as defined by their spending dollars as votes?
Film ratings as compared to box office success were a strong theme in much of the literature I read. Authors also included statistical support and research as evidence for their arguments. Jack Mathews, a writer for the Los Angeles Times has several things to say about movies and the way their ratings compare to how well they do at the box office. He says “the box office study, by Paul Kagan and Associates, indicated that movies rated either PG or PG-13 are three times as likely to gross more than $100 million than R-rated movies, and yet--and yet!--more than half of all movies released theatrically are rated R” (24). Norm Alster agrees with Mathews saying that “in the years 1984 through 1991, family films rated PG grossed an average of $30 million each; by contrast, films rated R took in on average just $19 million.” He also cites the same Kagan study as Mathews and explains that PG and PG-13 movies “also generate substantially more video revenue and (excepting the best animation) are generally cheaper to make. Of the top-grossing films of the 1990s, more than 70% are PG or PG-13” (61). John Podhoretz gives more statistics in his review of Michael Medved’s book Hollywood vs. America: Popular Culture and the War on Traditional Values. Podhoretz says that “in 1991, 61 percent of the movies released were rated R.” But in the book, a statistical study shows that “since 1980 . . . a given G or PG film is nearly five times more likely to place among the year’s box-office leaders than an R film.’” In general, movies rated R ‘generate substantially less revenue, return less profit, and are more likely to flop than films aimed at teen and family audiences’” (54). With these statistics in mind, one would think that more studios would make more G, PG, and PG-13-rated movies rather than R-rated ones.

According to the literature, it seems that people would rather see movies carrying a lower rating. Statistically speaking, it would be a smart choice. Mark
Canton, Columbia Pictures chairman, agrees: "'Any smart business person can see what we must do,' . . . 'Make more PG movies'" (quoted in Mathews 24).

Mathews goes on to say, "The industry does seem convinced that lower ratings are the way to go. There are more family/children’s movies on the major studio release schedule this year, [1993], than usual, and the studio production executives say they are concentrating on finding projects that will end up in the PG zone" (24).

Mathews also says audiences should continue to see more adult themes and family films. This is coming in part because of "the changing demographics, and Hollywood’s rediscovery of Baby Boom I, a generation now in its 40s" (24). Pat H. Broeske provides one example in Young Guns II, which the makers gave a PG-13 instead of an R rating to make it "more ‘accessible’ than the first which was R-rated" ("A New Wave of Issue-Oriented, Offbeat Movies Are Ready to Roll Into Theaters" 1). Alster says even Arnold Schwarzenegger requested that the violence in his movie Last Action Hero “be toned down” qualifying it for a PG rating (58).

In an article on G-rated movies and the lack thereof in the industry, Berardelli explains that “with few exceptions, today’s G-rated movies are frequently infantile. Young audiences know this and avoid these movies like the plague.” He would like to see the ratings system reevaluated so that certain ratings will not carry stigmas. Berardelli also says that this stigma causes marketing problems “similar to those attached to the X rating—either label elicits a public bias. Add to that the fact that G-movie audiences are mostly young children, who generally pay half price, and you’re talking about a financial handicap as well” (g01).

To help relieve some of the stigma and marketing problems, Berardelli suggests that the “MPAA . . . revise its ratings standards.” He thinks they should judge the whole context of the movies rather than the different parts, “possibly allowing certain mild and justifiable instances of language, violence and sexual content to be overlooked” (g01).
All in all, young audiences often patronize theatres wanting to see the forbidden R-rated films. Regardless of restrictions, many times they get in anyway, if they want to see the movie. However, no matter how many times they return and pay for admission, families are who film-makers should target. They are the ones with more money to spend, but they also want more wholesome fare. This is a large market the industry should tap into to reap the full benefits of the business.

VALUES

Values is an area hard to conceptualize for most people. Each person has his or her own opinions, beliefs, and values about how life should be lived. Yet there are many common threads throughout the lives of the people in America and the world. Many of these threads relate to their value systems.

In an interview in *Premiere* magazine, Peter Biskind asked many of the top studio chiefs this question: "Do you think studios have a responsibility for the values embodied by their movies?" Terry Semel, president/COO of Warner Bros. replied:

"Definitely. If you look at our movies, they have become more conscious of issues like smoking, drinking, drugs, seat belts, and the environment. Instead of fourteen people smoking in every movie or everyone casually picking up a drink or using drugs, you'll find less and less of that. Everybody who gets in a car nowadays wears seat belts, even in Lethal Weapon. So movie executives can be more conscious about current social issues" (quoted in Biskind 84).

Answering the same question, Mark Canton, chairman of Columbia Pictures, said studios "have to be conscious of what the message in the movie is, about whom it might offend or slight or damage" (quoted in Biskind 84).

Thinking about others is important, but it is also important to think about one's own beliefs. Actress Glen Close in an interview with *Entertainment Weekly*, said, "Fads will come and go and people will be hot and cold, but the thing you have to fight for tenaciously is to choose things for very personal reasons. That will be
the sum of your career, not because you think something will make a lot of money or somebody thinks it'll be good for you” (quoted in Dana Kennedy 21). This idea applies not only to actors but to every other aspect of the movie industry. Steven Spielberg believes the same; that is why he made *Schindler’s List*. He says, “We have a responsibility. We have a duty to voice our opinion and to work to fix the world” (quoted in Dotson Rader 7). He also says that he is very old-fashioned which shows through in his films. He mentions that “ninety percent of [his] movies are old-fashioned” and that “a lot of the films [he has] made probably could have worked just as well 50 years ago.” He says that he has “a lot of old-fashioned values” which show through in his work (quoted in Rader 6).

British producer David Puttnam knows that films showing good values will do well. When he read the true story on which he based *Chariots of Fire*, he thought, “Here is a character who could make a great movie. Here is a character who stands for something bigger than himself—putting duty to God before worldly success.” He then helped turn “*Chariots of Fire* into an exploration of moral values” (quoted in John Culhane 105).

John Avildsen, director of *Rocky*, says “great movies are movies with great characters. Characters who stand for something bigger than themselves. That something is good values... universal values that reflect the basic good in people: hard work, self-respect, love of family, friends, community and God. In an age when so many films show mindless violence and sex without intimacy, the public embraces ... movies that sell neither (quoted in Culhane 108). Director Mark Rydell says that films such as *Rocky, Chariots of Fire, Gandhi*, and *Driving Miss Daisy* ‘show ... how the individual can make a difference—in his own life and the lives of others’” (quoted in Culhane 108). Avildsen says, “One of their messages is that ordinary individuals are capable of extraordinary acts. We keep coming back to hear
that message, back to drink at the well with good water” (quoted in Culhane 108).
Audiences want to see films with good storylines and strong convictions.

Carey Kinsolving quotes Ted Baehr, president of the Christian Film and Television Commission, as saying:

“What is surprising is that the heads of the motion picture studios continue to be amazed when movies with Christian themes and wide audience appeal, such as Chariots of Fire or A Man Called Peter, consistently make big money at the box office. Ben-Hur literally saved MGM from bankruptcy in 1959, just as The Ten Commandments rescued struggling Paramount from the brink in 1956” (c07).

Film critic Michael Medved, cohost of PBS's 'Sneak Previews,' agrees: “There is a tendency in Hollywood to only take seriously work that shakes people up.” His suggestion is that after 20 years of “shock, Hollywood’s only hope is to lure [audiences] back with more intelligent, more wholesome fare” (quoted in Alster 62).

According to Podhoretz, Medved believes that Hollywood really does not care what the general public wants (53). Alster says “with moviegoers turned off by a steady torrent of sex and violence, the explicit films now bomb with regularity.” He also quotes Tom Pollock, chairman of the MCA Motion Picture Group, as saying, “I think that adults are less interested purely in violence than ever before” (61).

Others agree that audiences want to see more quality storylines but disagree with Medved that Hollywood does not care. The industry has to care because the bottom line is that it will not continue to make money if it does not give America what it wants to see. Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, “predicts Hollywood will clean up its films in order to reverse the long decline in movie attendance” (Alster 58). Attendance and money seem to be what it all comes down to. Tom Pollock puts it in a business-oriented way, “If you wish to make money and you believe that your audience is turning more conservative, yes,
be more conservative because it’s profitable. . . . You can simply say, ‘It’s good business to do it’” (quoted in Biskind 86). And a business it ultimately is.

**FAMILY-ORIENTED FILMS**

Value-oriented movies can hold any particular rating including R; whereas, family-oriented films are tailored for family audiences regardless of age. Family-oriented movies are another group the industry needs to explore. “Forbes asked Alan Ladd Jr., co-chairman of the board at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, if he sees a trend toward more conservative, family-oriented films.” He replied that it looked as if the trend was headed that way. When asked why, he said, “I guess because they’re making money.” Because of the money involved, “both Columbia Pictures and Twentieth Century Fox are planning to concentrate more on the under exploited family movie market segment” (Alster 61). But just because Hollywood has decided that they will focus movies in this area does not mean that they like it. According to John Zipperer, “Hollywood is more open to family entertainment than it has been for decades, and television and movie viewers already are seeing the results on their screens. Movie companies and broadcast networks searching for audiences are turning--perhaps reluctantly--to family-oriented entertainment” (62). Part of the shift, says Calvin College professor Quentin Schultze, is due to the fact that "adolescents have moved from theatres to video, a demographic shift that raises the average age of filimgoers and opens the market to ‘films that are less action-oriented and have more subtle themes and more sophisticated characterization’” (quoted in Zipperer 62). Agent Rick Christian says he thinks "there’s a tremendous market out there for [family oriented], ‘quiet films’” (Zipperer 62).

In Peter Biskind’s *Premiere* interview, he asked if the studio chiefs “think the family values issue is a legitimate one.” Joe Roth, chairman of Twentieth Century Fox, replied, “What ultimately brings people to movies is their kinship to the concept” (quoted in Biskind 85). If people can find movies with a theme they agree
with or like, they will attend them. Studio chiefs, executives, producers, directors, and numbers of other people in Hollywood know this (Biskind 85).

For those who are concerned with the religious side of movies, Michael Medved has another statistic. He says that over the past decade, he found only seven movies with a positive religious message, when every week 78 million Americans attend church, . . . only 19 million go to the movies” (Podhoretz 53).

FILM CONTENT

One area that seems touchy for the film-makers and viewers, especially critics such as Michael Medved, is the issue of the film’s content. Everything about the film makes it what it is, including storyline, characterization, dialogue, actors, language, sexual situations, and violence. In an interview with Entertainment Weekly, actress Meryl Streep said that “films operate on the level of dreams and fears and projections” (quoted in Kennedy 19). Either they are idealistic, romantic, or completely unrealistic. They still have influence, however. Steven Spielberg, after making home films as a young person, moved to film-making. Looking back at that time, he says, “I had learned that film was power . . . I didn’t use words. I used a camera, and I discovered what a tool and a weapon, what an instrument of self-inspection and self-expression it is” (quoted in Rader 5).

Film certainly has power. It is a strong force in society, often determining what is popular or what will become popular. However, it is not always truthful or realistic. Television has much the same influence. Podhoretz says the characters in it “are murdered at a rate a thousand times greater than people in real life.” He also says a Planned Parenthood study conducted in 1988 revealed that “the three major television networks broadcast a total of more than 65,000 sexual references annually or 27 an hour” (54). This is considerable violence and sex.

Scenes with sex and violence are more common in the theatre than on television screens. In the film industry, many add it to their movies to give them a
higher rating in order to attract bigger audiences. Berardelli says that many times “bits of profane dialogue or brief interludes of violence or sex” are added “just to avoid the box office pall of G.” He thinks that PG is even developing a stigma of sorts” (Podhoretz 53). Medved reports that “in 1991, the average R-rated movie [contained] 22 F-words, 14 S-words, and 5 A-words—providing its viewers with a major obscenity every two-and-a-half minutes” (Podhoretz 53). One author says that bad language got a big boost in 1968 when the f-word was first used by a woman in the movie I’ll Never Forget Whatshisname. At the time this particular book was written, Brian De Palma’s 1984 Scarface held the record for the most use of the f-word ever in a movie--206 times, “an average of once every twenty-nine seconds” (David Wellechinsky 54).

According to several authors, this overuse of sex, violence, and bad language is not what viewers really want to see and hear. Ted Baehr in an interview with the Los Angeles Times said, “There is a myth that to capture a large audience you have to have sex, violence, nudity and profanity; . . . that is false” (quoted in David Fox, “In the Category of Family-Value Films . . . Christian Group Lauds Efforts to ‘Reach Out to the Broad Audience.’” 1). The industry is finally starting to notice. Broeske says “story-driven films” are what is “hot—not heavy-artillery, big-budget, big-star sequels” (“Hollywood’s ‘91 Focus: a Good Story” 1). President of Disney’s Buena Vista Pictures Distribution, Dick Cook, agrees that “the emphasis has shifted to stories—to substance rather than glitz” (quoted in Broeske, “Hollywood’s ‘91 Focus: a Good Story” 1). Medved believes that as “an industry that uses the slogan of freedom of choice, [it is] finally giving the audience some freedom of choice.” He thinks “the audience is grateful” (quoted in Zipperer 62). Another industry leader, Barry London, president of Paramount Pictures’ motion picture group explains why he thinks ideas are changing: “What we’ve seen lately reaffirms that the most important star is the story, but every movie is a business unto itself.” Paramount

THE MESSAGES IN AND INFLUENCE OF MOVIES & TV

Through their content, TV and the film industries influence and convey messages to their audiences. In an interview with Parade, Steven Spielberg admitted that he does not let his “kids watch a lot of television, as [his] parents didn’t let [him].” He does think that censoring the news from his children is a mistake because he doesn’t want “them coming of age and suddenly realizing that there’s a whole world out there that they missed and they’re ill-prepared to accept” (quoted in Rader 6). Director Barry Levinson is very concerned about television news, more so than with “cops-and-robbers shows.” He explains:

“‘Media create problems for society even when they report information without coloring,’ he says. ‘It creates anxiety, period. The constant infusion of information only increases that anxiety. Look at the earthquakes. If you sit and watch the coverage, you get totally frazzled; if you don’t, life moves on. We’re junkies, and this information blitz is like junk food. When it’s over, it’s gone and forgotten’” (quoted in Kornbluth 103+).

He thinks TV sends the wrong messages to its viewers: “TV says to us, ‘That’s a great-looking car, get it. Those are fabulous tennis shoes, get them. That’s a wonderful toy, get it.’ Nowhere does it say, ‘You can get this, but not right away--first you have to work [italics his] for it’” (quoted in Kornbluth 101). As for television’s influence, he disagrees with many: “We all watched Ozzie & Harriet and Father Knows Best,” if TV is so influential, why aren’t we all great parents?” (quoted in Kornbluth 103).

Influence of movies and television has been an issue for decades among groups concerned about the impact of movie and TV violence and their roles as society role models. Medved disagrees with Levinson on the idea of influence. In
just as convincing an argument, he says: “Don’t [industry leaders] see the inconsistency in arguing that a 30-second commercial for floor polish will change people’s behavior at the supermarket and then turning around and saying that a 30-minute program showing violence and rape and horror has no influence on people’s behavior?” (quoted in Joe Maxwell 39). The same author goes on to say “they are simply asking Hollywood to realize the influence its products have on society” (39). He says that even Christians and other conservatives do not change what they watch due to content or the influence it has on them. “A straw poll taken by Evans of a group of single Christian adults . . . [showed that] three-fourths of those polled said ‘movies containing vulgarities, explicit sex, nudity, and antibiblical messages had an adverse effect on their moral and spiritual condition” (quoted in Maxwell 39).

Taking some of the responsibility for what is available entertainment, Jeffrey Katzenberg, Walt Disney Studios chairman, spoke at a Video Software Dealers Association in July 1992 and told his audience:

“'When our critics charge that we show violence that is too graphic, depict sex that is too gratuitous, or feature lyrics that are too inflammatory, we’re all too quick to offer the defense that it’s only a movie or piously invoke the First Amendment. The sad result is that more and more movies are uninspiring or formulaic . . . seemingly driven to offer nothing more than the cheap thrill.' He urged Hollywood to take responsibility for the ‘messages in our media’” (quoted in Biskind 83).

IMPACT OF AWARDS

The Academy Awards are somewhat of a determinant of what movies will take a leap in attendance in the Spring of each year. Nina J. Easton says “there’s nothing like a few Academy Award nominations [or awards] to boost box office receipts” (9). Another author agrees that Hollywood is host to “two competitions.” The two of importance are “the competition for the votes of the Academy members,
and the competition for the dollars of the moviegoing public. . . . [In 1990], the race for Oscar votes had a profound effect on the race for box office dollars, and . . . any movie that had been nominated for a few Academy Awards saw its business increase dramatically” (Steve Pond b07).

Steinberg admits that “a Best Picture Oscar can easily generate from two million dollars to ten million dollars in additional revenues for its studio.” This happened with the film *Annie Hall* after it won Best Picture in 1977. In the ten-to-twelve day period following its win, the film made another $4,745,000 in grosses. *The Sting* stayed in theatres another nine months after winning “its Best Picture Oscar [in 1973], earning more than $10,000,000 in that time” (196).

Lawrence Cohn shares some statistics: “*Dances With Wolves* (1990) attracted 21.5 percent of its audience after Academy voters had spoken; *Driving Miss Daisy* (1989) drew 23 percent; *Rain Man* (1988), 17.3 percent; and *Platoon* (1986), 25.4 percent. Bernardo Bertolucci’s *The Last Emperor* sold a whopping 42.6 percent of its tickets after winning Best Picture and eight other Oscars—and it could have used even more” (88). Not only the awards but also the nominations have an impact on attendance at theatres. John Krier, president of Exhibitor Relations, says “the Academy Award nominations played a big role” in the jump of ticket sales for movies such as *Rain Man, Mississippi Burning, Dangerous Liaisons, Working Girl,* and *The Accidental Tourist*” (Easton 9).

**GROSSES**

Money is an important part of the movie industry, if not the most important to keep the business running. Many of these authors realize this as well. Tom Pollock, chairman of the MCA Motion Picture Group, says “you still want to make money, which means you want to Give the Public What They Want, and if that changes, you must change with it” (quoted in Biskind 84). To give audiences what they want Ted Baehr, president of the Christian Film and Television Commission
and publisher of Atlanta-based *Movieguide*, suggests “that the industry ought to heed the commission’s opinions.” In 1992, “72% of [the] year’s top 25 box-office hits were deemed acceptable by *Movieguide*” (quoted in Fox, “In the Category of Family-Value Films . . . Christian Group Lauds Efforts to ‘Reach Out to the Broad Audience.’” 1). Another author brings out that after Home Alone “made Hollywood history grossing over $280 million in North America alone . . . its sequel [at the time of this article’s publication] had pulled $171 million--nine times what the average R-rated film grosses” (Alster 62).

**ATTENDANCE**

Hal Hinson says that “statistically” speaking . . . “the business of making movies [is] more lucrative than ever, [even] though the number of people actually going to the movies [is not] nearly as high as that fact might indicate” (g03). Berardelli brings out that in a research study “conducted for the MPAA, about one-third of Americans over the age of 12 report they never go to movies. And approximately half the adult population attends movies once a year or less” (g01). According to Podhoretz, “Movie attendance is half what it was 30 years ago, while the network-television audience is a third smaller than it was 15 years ago” (53).

Movie going audiences are shrinking. Ted Baehr believes he may have the solution: “In 1969, after much of Hollywood abandoned the [production] code, box office went down from 44 million weekly attendance to 17 million, and it’s never recovered,” he said in an interview with *The Washington Post*. “‘Basically, they killed the audience. It’s better to sell four tickets to a family than one to a teenager’” (quoted in Kinsolving c07). And as the literature showed before, families will spend more money when taking the whole family to the movies than young people who go see a movie even several times.
METHODS OF RESEARCH

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What films were the top grossing films in the last several years and how much money did they make?
2. Can we see any trends in the types of films that are the top money makers?
3. Which films have been bringing in the most money in the last five years: G, PG, PG-13, or R?
4. Are we seeing a trend toward more R-rated films?
5. Does literature show audiences’ tastes changing?
6. Do Awards from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences correlate with top-grossing films?
7. Are moviegoers’ tastes changing as defined by their spending dollars as votes?

HOW DATA WAS COLLECTED

When I first decided to do this research project, I thought the statistics, numbers, and dollar figures for the top-grossing films of the last ten or so years (1983-1993) would be easy to find. I was wrong. I began in Southern College’s McKee Library, scanning the Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature and looking through magazines for lists of top-grossing films. All I found were reviews and editorials of what other people thought were the best films of the year, no facts about which ones actually did the best according to box office receipts. Consulting the reference desk of the art department at the Hamilton County Bicentennial Library, I found they had an almanac listing Academy Award winners. The International Motion Picture Almanac lists Academy Award winners from the start of the Academy in 1927 through 1991, the history of the Oscar, and top-grossing films from 1979-1991. I felt as if I had struck gold. The only problem was that there were no dollar amounts. The latest Variety magazine (10-16 Jan. 1994), however, had the best and worst top 20
cost-to-return ratios of 1993 films published in a chart. This gave me something but not yet what I needed.

I searched Info-trak at the Ooltewah-Collegedale branch of the library for articles pertaining to film grosses, but this proved unsuccessful. Facts on File listed weekly and weekend grosses but none for a given year. The Facts On File Yearbook for 1992 listed the top ten grossing films of the previous year and their dollar figures, but the library had only one volume. I had to go back to the downtown branch where they had all of the Facts On File Yearbooks. However, the 1990-1993 Yearbooks were the only ones that listed the previous year's top ten films and their year-end grosses. This was only four years. Going back upstairs to the arts section, I found a Variety (3-9 Jan. 1994) listing the top 100 grossing films of 1993. Now I had five years but still needed to find the five years before that.

At this point, I started making phone calls to the Margaret Herrick Library of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences in Hollywood. I reached a librarian who was able to find the top ten grossing films of all-time in the United States and Worldwide. I asked if he could mail or fax the information to me, but he said "no" and "why not just come in." I told him I was in Tennessee and that would be a little difficult. He provided the information over the phone. The library has a three minute limit for reference calls and the time factor provided another obstacle: we had been on the phone too long. If I needed more information, I would have to call back, he said. To make matters worse, he told me that two of the sources he used, Hollywood Reporter and Art Murphy's Box Office Register would not be available in this region of the country. He did suggest trying to find a four volume set of Paul Kagan's Box Office Champions and looking at issues of Variety magazine.

I went back to the main branch of the public library downtown to look at back issues of Variety, hoping this would be it. The librarian in the arts department got
all of the last three January issues for the last ten years, but *Variety* had none of the
top-grossing films with their dollar figures listed. Another time I went downtown
to look at *The Book of Lists*, another book recommended by a librarian. It held lots
of interesting information, but not the data I needed.

I tried calling magazines such as *Boxoffice; Entertainment Data, Inc.; Film
Quarterly*; and *Entertainment Weekly*, but none of them had helpful data. Next, I
called Susan Shields at *Variety* because this magazine kept showing up as a source
for other publications' statistics. I got her voice-mail several times. It was another
couple of weeks before I actually got to talk to her. She said to go back to the first or
second January issues of *Variety* to find that information. That is what she would
have had to do herself because she did not have the information right on hand. I
returned to the downtown library for the last time to look through these *Variety*
issues and still did not find the information Susan Shields said I would.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Harris, my advisor and I asked the McKee Library staff to try
to locate and get *Art Murphy's Box Office Register* and *Paul Kagan's Box Office
Champions* through inter-library loan. At first I was told it would be about two
weeks before they got here. After the two weeks, I was told that it could take more
than two weeks to even locate them and then they had to be shipped here. I kept
calling only to find out over a month later that they were reference books that could
not be loaned and the closest one had been located at a university in Georgia.
Needless to say, I finally settled for the five years of data I did have.

At this point, I had to find the Academy Award winners of 1992 and 1993. I
watched the awards broadcast on ABC on March 21, 1994, to get the winners of 1993.
Then I called the Margaret Herrick Library in Hollywood again to find out the
winners of 1992. When I finally got through, a librarian was able to get the numbers
and winners I needed. Next I was off to Video Park in Ooltewah, Tenn. to find the
ratings for the movies in my top ten lists. After a few hours of running around the video store, I had the ratings for the movies on my lists.

HOW DATA WAS ORGANIZED

As far as the statistics and numbers are concerned, the data is organized in several ways. I started by charting the top ten grossing films from the last five years with their gross amounts for that given year, their ratings, and the number of Academy Awards they received that year. When I put the information into graph form, I started by showing how many G, PG, PG-13, and R-rated movies were the highest grossing for each year. This shows which movies with a particular rating were increasing and declining in popularity, as decided by audience dollars. Another graph looks at the amount of Academy Awards a particular rating category received in a given year. This shows whether or not the Academy looks at a movie’s rating as a qualification for an Oscar. The next graph shows a comparison of the number of films winning Oscars versus the total amount of Oscars the pictures won each year. This shows that there can be several awards given to only a couple of films. For instance, there could be two films in that year bringing in awards, but they may win nine altogether. Then I decided to make separate graphs for each year, showing the top ten grossing movies of that particular year with their total gross amounts charted. This shows a visible difference in the dollar amounts these movies brought in.

LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations to this study. The first is that ticket prices change every couple of years. This fact can actually distort the truth about which films were the top-grossing of all time. Movie prices have gone up over the years, making actual comparisons almost impossible. Comparing Jaws, a 1975 movie which came in six out of the top ten grossing films of all time in the United States, to Jurassic Park, a 1993 movie that came in number two on the same chart, will
show different dollar figures not only from the fact that one grossed more than the other, but because movie admission prices have gone up. *E.T.*, the number one grossing film of all time in the U.S., was also released in movie theatres twice, not once as all the other ones were. The dollar amounts listed are actual grosses and not figures that have taken changing economic conditions into consideration. With this in mind, we can still look at a given year and see which films brought in the most money during that period and not have to worry about changing prices during that year. Even if admission cost had changed, it would have affected all of the others at the same time.

Another limitation in this study was that it looked only at box office receipts. The video industry in many cases is also a good indicator of what audiences want to see, especially when patrons can rent films over and over again. Movies remain in a particular theatre for as long as it is drawing crowds enough to make its stay financially worthwhile. On the other hand, counting video rentals and purchases is difficult since researchers are not able to count how many times viewers watch videos in their homes. At the cinemas, each person must have a ticket, allowing the management to know exactly how many people are visiting its establishment.

Some sources disagree on the exact dollar amounts of the top ten films for a given year period. For the years 1989 through 1992, I used the 1990 through 1993 *Facts On File Yearbooks* as my sources. The information from the *Yearbooks* was compiled by Exhibitor Relations Co., *Variety*, and *USA Today*. For the 1993 numbers, I went to the January 3-9, 1994, issue of *Variety*, which listed the top-100 grossing films of 1993. I based my lists and charts on the figures from these sources. While I did not use them in my study, I found other figures in *People*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and *Variety*. The December 13, 1993 *People* magazine says that *Home Alone* became "the fourth-highest-grossing film of all time (more than $500 million worldwide), behind only *Jurassic Park, E.T.* and the original *Star Wars*"
(Karen S. Schneider 49). In contrast, the October 18, 1993, Variety says that Home Alone is the eighth top-grossing film of all time, grossing $474 million. In the U.S. it did place number four, grossing $285 million behind Star Wars, Jurassic Park, and E.T., according to the Hollywood Reporter July 12, 1993, issue.

Home Alone still showed a problem when tabulating the figures for the year 1990. As I said before, I used the Facts On File information, but other publications disagreed with their grosses for 1990. Facts On File says that Home Alone grossed $152.1 million and placed number three in the top ten (Hitchings, Facts On File 1990 Yearbook 1003). The January 8, 1991, Los Angeles Times says the same about Home Alone but shows Driving Miss Daisy at number eight, grossing $106.6 million (Broeske, “Hollywood’s ‘91 Focus: a Good Story” 1). Then the February 13, 1991, issue says that Home Alone was number one, grossing $222 million and that Dances With Wolves was number eight, grossing $103.9 million. Driving Miss Daisy does not even appear (“How Did Oscar Like the Hits?” 9). Likewise, Dances With Wolves and Driving Miss Daisy do not even make the Facts On File list. Instead, Presumed Innocent is listed in the number ten spot. From the different publication dates on these articles suggesting different numbers, I imagine the grosses were estimated at different times, not necessarily for the given year period.

This study only examines the four major rating categories. There are five total: G, PG, PG-13, R, and NC-17. Since the latter is not a major contender in the top-grossing films that visited theatres across America, it is not a part of this study.
RESULTS

During the five year period 1989-1993, G-rated films were absent in the first two years, then showed a rise in the last three, leveling out at a small number. PG-rated films were high the first two years, then dropped drastically in 1991, and they have continued to move up and down since then. PG-13-rated films started out high, dropped, moved up again, dropped a smaller margin, and finally moved up again. R-rated films on the other hand have shown a steady rise since 1989. The year 1993 carried the highest number of R-rated films doing well among the top ten grossing, the same as PG-rated films in 1990.

When choosing what films will win Oscars, the Academy does not look at a film’s specific rating category as a precursor. As the historical background of the Academy explains, members vote purely on what they like the best. The figures from the last five years show that in 1989, PG and PG-13-rated films were the ones receiving Oscars out of the top ten grossing. In 1990, the films awarded carried PG, PG-13, and R ratings, PG-rated films taking the most awards of the three, followed by the other two respectively. The year 1991 showed G, PG-13, and R-rated films taking awards. The R-rated movies were the most to receive awards, followed by G then PG-13. In 1992, G-rated Aladdin was the only film of the top ten to receive Academy Awards. In 1993, PG-13-rated films were the only ones to receive awards. The fluctuation from year to year shows that a movie’s rating is not a basis for an Academy Award. Further, there seems to be no correlation between Academy Award winning movies and their ratings.

Many different films with all different ratings won each year. However, of the films winning awards within a given year, some won more than one award. For instance, in 1989 three awards were given to three films. In 1990, seven awards were given to four films. In 1991, twelve awards were given to four films. In 1992,
two awards were given to one film. And in 1993, five awards were given to three films. These, of course, were among the top ten grossing films of each year.
The all-time top ten grossing films worldwide and U.S. only are as follows:

**All-time worldwide**

*(Grosses represented in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Awards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Jurassic Park</em> (1993)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>868.8**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ghost</em> (1990)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Star Wars</em> (1977)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Bodyguard</em> (1992)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade</em> (1989)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Home Alone</em> (1990)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jaws</em> (1975)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pretty Woman</em> (1990)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variety* 18 Oct. 1993. (Librarian at the Margaret Herrick Library in Hollywood)*


*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.*
All-time U.S. only
(Grosses represented in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Awards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.T. (1982)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>399.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Park (1993)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>339.5**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Wars (1977)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Alone (1990)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of the Jedi (1983)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>263.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaws (1975)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batman (1989)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raiders of the Lost Ark (1981)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills Cop (1984)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>234.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Empire Strikes Back (1980)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Art Murphy's Box Register. San Luis Obispo, CA: Art Murphy's Box Office Register, yearly pub.
(Sources provided by the Margaret Herrick Library of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.)

*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.
For the period 1989 through 1993, the top ten grossing films were as follows:

U.S. only as of Dec. 28, 1989
(Grosses represented in the millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Awards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batman (Warner Bros.)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>$251.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade (Para.)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>$195.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal Weapon 2 (Warner Bros.)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$147.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey, I Shrunk the Kids (Buena Vista)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>$129.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghostbusters II (Columbia)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>$112.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Who’s Talking (TriStar)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>$109.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood (Universal)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>$95.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Poets Society (Buena Vista)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>$94.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Harry Met Sally... (Columbia)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$91.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to the Future Part II (Universal)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>$81.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Awards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ghost (Paramount)</em></td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>206.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pretty Woman (Buena Vista)</em></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Home Alone (20th Century Fox)</em></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>152.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles (New Line)</em></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Hunt for Red October (Paramount)</em></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total Recall (TriStar)</em></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Die Hard 2 (20th Century Fox)</em></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dick Tracy (Touchstone)</em></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Back to the Future Part III (Universal)</em></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Presumed Innocent (Warner Bros.)</em></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.*
U.S. only as of Dec. 31, 1991  
(Grosses represented in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Awards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminator 2: Judgment Day (TriStar)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>204.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves (WB)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence of the Lambs (Orion)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Slickers (Columbia)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping With the Enemy (Fox)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Addams Family (Paramount)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naked Gun 2 1/2: The Smell of Fear (Para.)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles II:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Secret of the Ooze (New Line)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backdraft (Universal)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty and the Beast (Buena Vista)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.
U.S. only as of Dec. 31, 1992  
(Grosses represented in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Awards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Batman Returns</em> (Warner Bros.)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>165.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Home Alone 2</em> (20th Century Fox)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lethal Weapon 3</em> (Warner Bros.)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>144.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sister Act</em> (Buena Vista)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wayne’s World</em> (Paramount)</td>
<td>PG-13</td>
<td>121.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Basic Instinct</em> (TriStar)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aladdin</em> (Buena Vista)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A League of Their Own</em> (Columbia)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Bodyguard</em> (Warner Bros.)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Hand That Rocks the Cradle</em> (BV)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Academy Awards numbers provided by the Margaret Herrick Library of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.)  
*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.
### Title | Rating | Gross | Awards*
---|---|---|---
Jurassic Park (Universal) | PG-13 | 337.8 | 3
The Fugitive (Warner Bros.) | PG-13 | 179.3 | 1
The Firm (Paramount) | R | 158.3 | 0
Sleepless in Seattle (TriStar) | PG | 126.5 | 0
Aladdin (Buena Vista) | G | 117.9 | 2 (1992)
Indecent Proposal (Paramount) | R | 106.6 | 0
In the Line of Fire (Columbia) | R | 102.3 | 0
Mrs. Doubtfire (20th Century Fox) | PG-13 | 89.2 | 1
Cliffhanger (TriStar/Carolco) | R | 84 | 0
A Few Good Men (Columbia) | R | 78.2 | 0
Free Willy (Warner Bros.) | PG | 77.7 | 0

*Represents the number of Academy Awards (Oscars) received.
CONCLUSIONS/ANALYZE RESULTS

COMMENTARY/INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

In comparing the statistics—which movies brought in the most money in the last five years—and evaluating the literature, there seem to be many contradictions and some confirmations. This material will be covered in the following section as I address the research questions.

What films were the top-grossing films in the last several years and how much money did they make?

The top ten grossing films of the last five years, 1989-1993, along with their earnings are listed in the Results section (see p. 28-34). The number one grossing film for each year, however, was: Batman (1989), Ghost (1990), Terminator 2: Judgment Day (1991), Batman Returns (1992), and Jurassic Park (1993).

Can we see any trends in the types of films that are the top money-makers?

While there has been a distinct increase in R-rated movies in the last five years, there have been other obvious trends as well. Most of the top-grossing films are fairy tales or fanciful, far-fetched stories of heroes that could never be real human beings, such as the top grossers listed above. They also do not carry universal value-oriented storylines with strong, moral characters. The results reflect an ongoing trend in the creators of these movies. Many of the directors, producers, and writers are the well-known, big film-makers. Steven Spielberg and George Lucas, two such men, have made more widely loved, popular, and money-making films than any other film-makers in history. Sean Mitchell says “Spielberg and Lucas have directed seven of the 10 top grossing films of all time.” (“Spielberg and the Gang” 3). According to Dotson Radar, “seven of the films [Spielberg] has produced or directed are among the top 20 money-earners of all time” (4). This research confirms this statistic.
In the five year time period, 1989-1993, the movies within a given rating category showed various changes. The G-rated films increased from 1989 to 1993. The R-rated films increased markedly from 1989 to 1990 and then again from 1992 to 1993. The PG-rated films decreased from 1990 to 1993, and the PG-13-rated films fluctuated up and down from year to year. This dual increase may be one of the most important findings of this research. Ironically, while this research might seem to suggest the death and decline of the G-rated film, such a conclusion is premature. *Aladdin* is the only movie at all to rank in two years' top ten lists, and it carries a G-rating.

As for the types of films grossing the top dollars within each year, there were anywhere from one to three movies in the top five that could be classified as family films, made for both children and adults. *Aladdin* was one of these such films that tells a child's fairy tale, while supplying a dialogue written for adults. A new Disney full length animation, *The Lion King*, may try to capture box office dollars as much as its predecessors when it is released the summer of 1994. It remains to be seen if Hollywood can continue to pull off this kind of double-barreled entertainment.

On the other hand, the popular R-rated films are a mixture of action, adventure, science fiction, and drama films. *A Few Good Men*, number ten in 1993, lacked the usual violence and sexual situations, but still got an R rating because of bad language. As Alster explains, the “script . . . chiefly features cracking legal dialog,” yet it grossed $135 million by the time this article was printed in April 1993 (62). There were still violent films such as *Terminator 2* (1991) and *Basic Instinct* (1992), for instance, that pulled in huge grosses at the box office.

**Which films have been bringing in the most money in the last five years: G, PG, PG-13, or R?**

PG-13-rated films have made the most, followed by R, PG, and G respectively. By categorizing each rating and adding their grosses, some interesting results are

Are we seeing a trend toward more R-rated films?

The literature says that R-rated popularity should be decreasing, while the figures from the top ten grossing films in the last five years, 1989-1993, show that R-rated movies have increased in popularity, in that their number has grown and is the highest of any single category: out of 50 films, there are 19 R-rated, 14 PG-13-rated, 14 PG-rated, and three G-rated. Granted, G-rated films have gone up at the same time as the R-rated have, but not as much. The two in the last three years that have done the best are Walt Disney cartoons *Beauty and the Beast* and *Aladdin*. PG and PG-13-rated films have moved up and down from year to year, showing no real trend or consistency in ratings. However, by sheer numbers, 28 of the top-grossing films in the last five years have been PG or PG-13. This is more than half overall and more than half each year.

Does literature show audiences’ tastes changing?

Even movie industry leaders say that ideas are changing, that the public wants something different. They are tired of too much sex, violence, and bad language. They want more story based scripts where characters are developed. Even Hollywood is finally seeing the public’s desire and wants to cater to that audience. If not for personal values, industry leaders see better business in making these types of films.

Part of the strategy is to start making more family and story-oriented films and less action films. Maxwell notes the trend as well:

"While Hollywood’s product seems overall to be getting dirtier, there are signs that studio executives are beginning to tune back in to what many Americans want. . . . At the same time, executives are noticing the strong return that family films produce at the box office. For instance, in
1991, 36 percent of the top 25 grossing movies were rated G and PG, though 73 percent of all movies made that year were PG-13, R, or NC-17. In response, Paramount studio last November said it would start producing more 'family-oriented films' and Warner Brothers has announced plans to start a new division called Warner Brothers Family Films” (40).

In comparison to what he has to say, of the top ten grossing films of 1991 four were R, four PG-13, one PG, and one G-rated (Hitchings, Facts On File 1991 Yearbook 1015). These figures are from the top ten, not 25, grossing of 1991, but they are an interesting contrast with what others say.

Medved is one who contradicts some of the evidence. He says that in 1992, “61 percent of all movies were rated R.” At the time this article was written in 1993, “39 percent were rated R,” says Medved. “For the last five years, the R-rated films have had the lowest average box-office return. Now that they’ve finally reduced the number of R-rated films, that’s one of the reasons . . . the overall box office has gone up” (quoted in Zipperer 62). My study of the last five years shows that the movies actually grossing the most amount of money are the PG-13-rated films followed by R-rated ones. The total number of R-rated films ranking the highest has risen. Part of the reason for the box office average increasing could also be attributed to increased movie ticket prices. There are many variables that could account for these differences that Medved is not taking into consideration.

Other authors besides Medved agree that times are changing along with ideas for what is hot in the cinemas. Industry leaders also say they believe what audiences want is changing whether they like it or not. As a business, they will give the public what profits the industry the most.

From what I have read, I believe that in the last five years there has been a trend towards more popular R-rated films. They consistently bring in large amounts of money, but so do other films with lower ratings. I think as a result of
these kinds of movies bombarding cities all over the world, audiences have gotten
tired. Since they have gotten tired, they want something different. They want to see
quality stories with well-developed characters not frivolous death and immorality.
In the next few years, we should see what happens in Hollywood. If it is true that
audiences really want different films, we will either see movie themes continue to
change or theatre attendance drop.

Do Awards from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences correlate with
top-grossing films?

The literature and statistics show that the Academy helps boost box office
ticket sales for the movies that receive nominations and awards. Examples include
Annie Hall (1977), The Sting (1973), Dances With Wolves (1990), Driving Miss Daisy
Tourist (1988), which all either stayed in theatres for an extended period of time or
showed significant increases in revenue after an Academy nomination or winning
the Oscar (Steinberg 196, Cohn 88, Easton 9).

Are moviegoers' tastes changing as defined by their spending dollars as votes?

According to audiences' spending dollars, their tastes have been consistent in
the last several years.
Ratings comparison for the top ten grossing films: 1989–1993

The chart shows the number of films in each rating category for the years 1989 to 1993. The categories are G, PG, PG-13, R, and NC-17. The chart indicates a noticeable trend in the distribution of film ratings over these years.
Academy Awards for top-grossing films within a given rating category

The bar chart shows the number of awards won in each year from 1989 to 1993 for different rating categories: G, PG, PG-13, and R. The bars for each year are color-coded to indicate the rating category.
Academy awards for the top ten grossing films: 1989-1993
Top Ten 1989 Film Grosses

Film title

- Back to the Future Part II
- When Harry Met Sally...
- Dead Poets Society
- Parenthood
- Look Who's Talking
- Ghostbusters II
- Honey, I Shrunk the Kids
- Lethal Weapon 2
- Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade
- Batman
Top Ten 1990 Film Grosses

- Presumed Innocent
- Back to the Future Part III
- Dick Tracy
- Die Hard 2
- Total Recall
- The Hunt for Red October
- Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles
- Home Alone
- Pretty Woman
- Ghost
Top Ten 1991 Film Grosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film title</th>
<th>Gross (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beauty and the Beast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backdraft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naked Gun 2 1/2: The Smell of Fear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Addams Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping With the Enemy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Slickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence of the Lambs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminator 2: Judgment Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top Ten 1992 Film Grosses

- The Hand That Rocks the Cradle
- The Bodyguard
- A League of Their Own
- Aladdin
- Basic Instinct
- Wayne's World
- Sister Act
- Lethal Weapon 3
- Home Alone 2
- Batman Returns
Top Ten 1993 Film Grosses

A Few Good Men
Cliffhanger
Mrs. Doubtfire
In the Line of Fire
Indecent Proposal
Aladdin
Sleepless in Seattle
The Firm
The Fugitive
Jurassic Park
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

My suggestions for further research begin with finding a broader span of time to examine. Another way to research this topic was to conduct in-depth interviews with directors, producers, and writers. Questions could address reasons for the results of the statistics. Why are we seeing more R-rated films doing well when audiences seem to want more family-oriented films? Does Hollywood care what the average American wants? Is money all that matters to most people in the industry?

Another area that should be explored more closely is the video tape industry. I researched movies released within a given year in the theatres, but video tape rentals and purchases could show stronger trends for determining which movies are actually the most popular over a long period of time. When movies are in the cinemas, they are only there for a short time. The two major problems I can see with this study would be that video tape rentals cannot be monitored closely enough to determine how many times the viewer watched them once they got them home. The same goes for purchases in that once the tape is owned by a family, it will not be rented again, but watched over and over again at home. Monitoring how many times a movie has been watched might be addressed through a survey.

A study into the demographics of movie audiences would be another interesting area to look at for further study. There are many different audiences from families to teenagers to the elderly. Researching who are the most frequent patrons and which ones have the most money to offer theatres would show a different side to this area of study.

STRENGTHS

The main strength of this research was that it brought together data that could not be found in the form I have put it into. It also sets a baseline for further longitudinal research. By establishing data on five years, future data can be collected and stronger correlations, trends, and conclusions made.
WEAKNESSES

The main weakness of this research project is the fact that I could not get a broader coverage of years to analyze. Originally, I wanted to look at least the top grossing films of the last ten years. I believe trends would have been more evident if more years were available to examine.
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APPENDIX A

Hard copies of the data
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\textit{Look}. Comedy that revolves around the idea of a new play—the audience's response to the performer's performance—\textit{The Seven Year Itch} by George Cukor. In London, at the Drury Lane Theatre, July 17.

\textit{Mary Wives of Windsor}. Shakespeare's comedy about the mysterious Sir John Falstaff—played by the actress Pat Cashman—\textit{in Washington, D.C., Folger Theatre, May 28.}

\textit{Rider in a Box}. One man monologue by actor Ian Charleson about Mr. Garrow's life as a spy. In New York City, at the Mitzl E. New Theater at Lincoln Center, Nov. 14.


\textbf{Top-Grossing Films}

Top-grossing films were the \textit{Star Wars} series, released in 1977, together with the \textit{Star Trek} films, released in 1979, to compile a list of the highest-grossing films released in 1989, together with estimated box-office receipts as of Dec. 31. This information was compiled by Exhibitor Relations Co.

1. \textit{Ghost}, Paramount ($206.1 million).
5. \textit{The Hunt for Red October}, Paramount ($127.7 million).
7. \textit{Dick Tracy}, Touchstone ($103.7 million).
8. \textit{Back to the Future, Part III}, Universal ($87.6 million).

\textbf{Books}

\textbf{Best Sellers}. Publishers Weekly of Dec. 28 listed the following hardback and paperback best sellers:

\textbf{Fiction Hardback}

2. \textit{The Witching Hour}, by Anne Rice (Knopf).
5. \textit{Long Shot}, by Dick Francis (Putnam).

\textbf{General Hardback}

1. \textit{A Life on the Road}, by Charles Kuralt (Putnam).
2. \textit{The Civil War: An Illustrated History}, by Geoffrey C. Ward et al. (Knopf).
3. \textit{Bo Knows Bo}, by Bo Jacob and Dick Schnapp (Doubleday).
4. \textit{Millie's Book: As Dictated to Barbara Walters} by Millie the Horse (Morrow).
The photograph was a triumph for the bound Galileo probe, which had rendered almost useless by a broken antenna during its cruise to Jupiter. Photographs made public by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided the close-up images of an asteroid.

Silicon 'Neuron' Engineered. Scientists from the California Institute of Technology and Oxford University in England had devised a silicon microchip that behaved much like a human brain cell, or neuron, according to a report in the British journal Nature Dec. 19.

Standard computer circuitry broke down information into discrete bits of "digital" data represented by components that were turned "on" or "off," which were encoded as the number one or zero. But the human brain operated in the "analog" mode, meaning that it processed steady flows of data through electrical impulses that could vary in strength. The new chip acted like a brain cell because it dealt with information in its natural form without having to break it down.

In another feature, the chip was extremely energy-efficient. It used one millionth of the amount of power that a comparable digital chip used.

The agency faulted foreign research. The U.S. National Institutes of Health had made, according to a report in the journal Science, the length of a day diminished by an average of 14 thousandths of a second each year, although the fluctuations could amount to as much as two milliseconds.

U.S. faulted on foreign research. The U.S. National Institutes of Health had failed to make sure that human research subjects were adequately safeguarded in collaborations between U.S. scientists and foreign ones, according to a report by the agency's Office for Protection from Research Risks disclosed July 18.

Confusion and lack of awareness about the NIH's guidelines for foreign collaboration resulted in many U.S. researchers violating them inadvertently, the office said. Those guidelines required that U.S. scientists review the ethics of all experiments involving federal materials and conducted outside the U.S.

The agency singled out AIDS researcher Robert C. Gallo of the National Cancer Institute as an example. Gallo had provided biological agents and performed analyses for French researcher Daniel Zagury in his trials of an AIDS vaccine in France and Zaire. [See p. 434E3]

The report claimed that Zagury had failed to notify the U.S. that three Frenchmen had died in the trials after being injected with an experimental vaccine, and that he had inoculated 10 Zaireans with a vaccine intended for monkeys.

Because of the controversy, the office ordered that all future U.S. collaborations involving Gallo or Zagury undergo special review.

Top-Grossing Films

Top-Grossing Films. The following were the top-grossing films released in 1991, together with their estimated box-office receipts as of Dec. 31. This information was compiled by Exhibitor Relations Co. and Variety. [See 1990, p. 1003C3]

1. Terminator 2: Judgment Day, Tri-Star ($204.3 million)
2. Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves, Warner Bros. ($165.5 million)
3. The Prince of the Lambs, Orion ($130.7 million)
4. City Slickers, Columbia ($120.7 million)
5. Sleeping with the Enemy, 20th Century Fox ($100.3 million)
6. The Addams Family, Paramount ($93.8 million)
7. Naked Gun 2½: The Smell of Fear, Paramount ($86.8 million)
8. Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles II: The Secret of the Ooze, New Line ($78.7 million)
9. Backdraft, Universal ($77.7 million)
10. Beauty and the Beast, Buena Vista ($75.6 million)

Books

Best Sellers. Publishers Weekly of Dec. 27 listed the following hardback and paperback best sellers:

Fiction Hardback

1. Scarlett: The Sequel to Margaret Mitchell's Gone With the Wind, by Alexandra Ripley (Warner)
2. No Greater Love, by Danielle Steel (Delacorte)
3. The Sum of All Fears, by Tom Clancy (Putnam)
5. The Doomsday Conspiracy, by Sidney Sheldon (Morrow)

General Hardback

1. Me: Stories of My Life, by Katharine Hepburn (Knopf)
2. Den of Thieves, by James B. Stewart (Simon & Schuster)
4. Uh-Oh: Some Observations from Both Sides of the Refrigerator Door, by Robert Fulghum (Villard)
5. The Best Treatment, by Isadore Rosenfeld (Simon & Schuster)

Mass Market Paperbacks

1. Jurassic Park, by Michael Crichton (Ballantine)
2. The Plains of Passage, by Jean Auel (Bantam)
3. The Prince of Tides, by Pat Conroy (Bantam)
4. Cold Fire, by Dean Koontz (Berkley)
5. Circle of Friends, by Maeve Binchy (Del)

Music

Best-Selling Records and Tapes. Billboard magazine Dec. 28 listed the five best-selling singles and the five best-selling record, tape and compact disc albums in the U.S. as the following:

Singles

1. "Black or White," Michael Jackson (Epic)
2. "It's So Hard to Say Goodbye to Yesterday," Boyz II Men (Motown)
nings

Musical adapted from Leo the by Daniel Levine. Lyrics by F. Doshi, John Cunningham, Max, Jerry Lanning at the Circle in the Square Theater.


First Russian Book Prize Awarded. Russian author Mark Kharitonov was awarded the first Russian Book Prize. Kharitonov won the prize for his novella, Lines of Fate, about a scholar's discovery of the writings of a turn-of-the-century philosopher and the scholar's attempts to unravel the mystery surrounding them.

Awards

Medal of Freedom Presented. President Bush awarded the Medal of Freedom, the U.S.'s highest civilian honor, to 10 people who called some of "our finest Americans" at a ceremony in Washington, D.C. Dec. 11.

The recipients were former talk show host Johnny Carson, stock-car racing driver Richard Petty, violinist Isaac Stern, journalist David Brinkley, author the Wiesel, diplomat Harry W. Shindling, architect I.M. Pei, singer Ella Fitzgerald, actor Henry Fonda, and former Secretary of Labor, John W. Helms, a former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Fitzgerald and Helms were not in attendance.

First Russian Booker Prize Awarded. Russian author Mark Kharitonov was awarded the first Russian Booker Prize. Kharitonov won the prize for his novella, Lines of Fate, about a scholar's discovery of the writings of a turn-of-the-century philosopher and the scholar's attempts to unravel the mystery surrounding them.

Top-Grossing Films

Top-Grossing Films. The following were the top-grossing films released in 1992, together with their estimated box-office receipts, as of Dec. 31. This information was compiled by Exhibitor Relations Co. and reported by USA Today. [See p. 106321]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE/DISTRIBUTOR</th>
<th>DOMESTIC</th>
<th>FOREIGN</th>
<th>WORLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jurassic Park (U)</td>
<td>$337,832,005</td>
<td>$530,300,000</td>
<td>$868,132,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Fugitive (WB)</td>
<td>$179,257,409</td>
<td>$169,839,557</td>
<td>$349,096,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thelma &amp; Louise (BV)</td>
<td>$84,049,211</td>
<td>$139,138,616</td>
<td>$223,187,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Home Alone</td>
<td>$106,614,159</td>
<td>$151,764,559</td>
<td>$258,318,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indecent Proposal (Par)</td>
<td>$59,343,181</td>
<td>$11,236,122</td>
<td>$70,579,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Firm (Par)</td>
<td>$53,133,660</td>
<td>$54,736,149</td>
<td>$108,169,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Crossover (TriStar)</td>
<td>$41,634,711</td>
<td>$15,529,000</td>
<td>$57,163,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mrs. Doubtfire (Fox)</td>
<td>$37,307,487</td>
<td>$106,166,000</td>
<td>$143,473,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Robin Hood: Men in Tights (Fox/CTS)</td>
<td>$22,548,086</td>
<td>$9,115,294</td>
<td>$31,663,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Home Alone 2 (Fox)</td>
<td>$37,307,487</td>
<td>$106,166,000</td>
<td>$143,473,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Last Action Hero (Col)</td>
<td>$27,515,786</td>
<td>$42,750,000</td>
<td>$70,265,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Snow White &amp; the Seven Dwarfs (BV)</td>
<td>$22,548,086</td>
<td>$9,115,294</td>
<td>$31,663,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Robin Hood: Men in Tights (Fox/CTS)</td>
<td>$22,548,086</td>
<td>$9,115,294</td>
<td>$31,663,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tootsie (Par)</td>
<td>$37,307,487</td>
<td>$106,166,000</td>
<td>$143,473,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Home Alone 2: Lost in New York (BV)</td>
<td>$41,350,011</td>
<td>$15,529,000</td>
<td>$57,163,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mrs. Doubtfire (Fox)</td>
<td>$37,307,487</td>
<td>$106,166,000</td>
<td>$143,473,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Home Alone (BV)</td>
<td>$41,350,011</td>
<td>$15,529,000</td>
<td>$57,163,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Younger Woman (U)</td>
<td>$37,307,487</td>
<td>$106,166,000</td>
<td>$143,473,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Made in America (WB)</td>
<td>$44,535,114</td>
<td>$57,016,000</td>
<td>$101,551,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Rising Sun (Fox)</td>
<td>$42,750,000</td>
<td>$54,736,149</td>
<td>$97,486,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Falling Down (WB)</td>
<td>$40,903,593</td>
<td>$55,010,000</td>
<td>$95,913,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Demolition Man (WB)</td>
<td>$62,784,867</td>
<td>$36,156,074</td>
<td>$98,940,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sister Act (BV)</td>
<td>$41,634,711</td>
<td>$15,529,000</td>
<td>$57,163,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mrs. Doubtfire (Fox)</td>
<td>$41,634,711</td>
<td>$15,529,000</td>
<td>$57,163,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Lea Vissi (Sanctum)</td>
<td>$89,199,899</td>
<td>$1,549,134</td>
<td>$90,748,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Dave (WB)</td>
<td>$63,770,710</td>
<td>$25,441,220</td>
<td>$89,211,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Cinderella (BV)</td>
<td>$77,909,625</td>
<td>$5,520,234</td>
<td>$83,431,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Under Siege (BV)</td>
<td>$4,963,896</td>
<td>$86,342,871</td>
<td>$91,306,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The Crying Game (Miramax/Various)</td>
<td>$59,343,181</td>
<td>$11,236,122</td>
<td>$70,579,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Alive@84 (Par)</td>
<td>$36,733,699</td>
<td>$7,352,207</td>
<td>$44,085,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Jungle Book (BV)</td>
<td>$96,241,899</td>
<td>$43,892,203</td>
<td>$139,134,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. A New Hope (U)</td>
<td>$59,373,590</td>
<td>$11,236,122</td>
<td>$70,579,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The Piano (Miramax/Classy 2000)</td>
<td>$12,750,169</td>
<td>$50,407,069</td>
<td>$63,157,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Cool Runnings (BV)</td>
<td>$59,373,590</td>
<td>$11,236,122</td>
<td>$70,579,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Addams Family Values (Par)</td>
<td>$42,505,865</td>
<td>$16,514,822</td>
<td>$59,019,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Unforgiven (BV)</td>
<td>$42,505,865</td>
<td>$16,514,822</td>
<td>$59,019,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Studio 54 (U)</td>
<td>$41,634,711</td>
<td>$15,529,000</td>
<td>$57,163,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Dinner at the Stables (BV)</td>
<td>$2,017,203</td>
<td>$86,342,871</td>
<td>$88,359,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Dragon (U)</td>
<td>$35,109,129</td>
<td>$21,480,000</td>
<td>$56,589,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. A Perfect World (WB)</td>
<td>$27,002,711</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$27,002,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The Rock (Par)</td>
<td>$27,002,711</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$27,002,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The Insider (U)</td>
<td>$27,002,711</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$27,002,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The Three Musketeers (BV)</td>
<td>$45,482,830</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$45,482,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Age of Innocence (Col)</td>
<td>$3,181,347</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$3,181,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Hocus Pocus (BV)</td>
<td>$33,016,848</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$33,016,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Beauty &amp; the Beast (BV)</td>
<td>$41,116,450</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$41,116,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Many titles are in current or initial release.
APPENDIX B

INDUSTRY FILM RATING SYSTEM:

On November 1, 1968, member companies of the Motion Picture Association put into effect a voluntary film program with all pictures released after that date to carry one of four identifying rating symbols on all prints, trailers, advertising and at theatre box offices. The four categories were originally “G” for general audiences; “M” for adults and mature young people, on which parental discretion is advised; “R” for attendance restricted to persons over 16, unless accompanied by parent or adult guardian and “X” pictures to which no one under 16 is admitted. On March 1, 1970, the “M” rating was changed to “GP” (all ages admitted--parental guidance) and later this was changed to “PG.” In 1984 a new rating was introduced: PG-13, for films which parents are cautioned to give special guidance for children under 13 years of age.

In September of 1990 the “X” rating was changed to “NC-17,” or “No Children Under 17,” in hopes of removing the pornographic connotation of the “X” (20A).

Source for the Industry Film Rating System: