

CI 1615 E Myles

First name: Emma

Last name: Myles

Q1:

An entirely new framework should be developed, as there is currently confusion with things like the difference between M15+ and MA15+ - they seem too similar to the average person. Also, a new rating is needed for video games to allow the accurate classification of adult content, since many games that are classified as 18+ in most countries (such as the US and UK) are being pushed into the MA15+ category, meaning young children are accessing games not suitable for them.

Q2:

To help people make accurate decisions on what content is suitable for themselves and their families - in order to do this, it needs to be simple - the similarity between M and MA means that parents often misunderstand that MA content is not suitable for young teens.

Q3:

No. People often believe that games should be classified differently because they are interactive, but fail to realise that movies/TV is often more immersive since the emphasis is on storyline. People connect and relate to movie/TV characters and use their imagination, whilst many games actually ignore story and just focus on gameplay, meaning players don't necessarily connect to what's going on.

Q4:

No

Q5:

Yes, obviously. Why else would you classify content if you are not considering the potential impact of that content??

Q6:

Absolutely not. Content should be classified purely on the content - it doesn't matter who it reaches, because the content remains the same.

Q7:

It is an interesting point, even if there is no classification, perhaps it should be mandatory for a gallery to disclose any potential issues. I don't entirely see the point of actually classifying artwork, since the vast majority is no issue and nudity is an acceptable and normal thing in art.

Q8:

If it was, it would be difficult to convey those classifications. You can't expect to announce a rating before each song, the way that is done for TV and movies.

Q9:

No. It shouldn't be classified with regards to audience, it should be classified purely in regards to content.

Q10:

Unsure of what is meant by this question, as media is usually shown in both public and home situations. If the question is referring to classification of websites, then I'm unsure how that would ever be possible.

Q11:

Purely on content.

Q12:

Access to online content SHOULDN'T be controlled. Parents should take responsibility for media that their children see and this includes on the internet. Once we allow the government to restrict some content, where does it stop? Will they restrict political issues like euthanasia, which we have every right to learn about? Government restriction on websites risks becoming like China, where the government bans any website that they deem "dangerous" to their ideals. The government has no right to force their ideals on the country.

Q13:

Parents should be responsible for their children, they should actually BE parents for once. Media on the internet is exactly like media such as TV and movies - parents need to take responsibility for what their children see and make decisions for their children's interest.

Q14:

I think it is controlled enough.

Q15:

TV, movies, games.

Q16:

They should classify, but not restrict. We want to look after children, but also allow adults access to adult material and to be able to choose what they watch.

Q17:

Surely if the industry regulated itself, you would get things being rated to aid sales (ie things fitting into lower ratings than they should).

Q18:

-

Q19:

The government should consider this not only for small independent films, but media for any independent company. This includes video games, which are being made in Australia more and more but the government is not supporting them.

Q20:

Not understood. Most people think G and PG are practically the same and that M and MA are practically the same. This is why we need an R rating for games - parents don't think MA is a big deal, but they will think buying their teen an R rating is a big deal! Because of the misunderstanding of M and MA, parents make inappropriate decisions (in games and movies) for their teens.

Q21:

Yes, an R rating for games, to enable R content to actually be classified as R instead of somehow fitting into MA (where as I previously mentioned, parents often think it's ok for under 15s because it's too similar to M). We should reference the US and the UK systems, where simple abbreviations and ratings that differ a lot in age (none of the "two ratings for the same age bracket).

Q22:

The same classification systems should be used for TV, movies and games - it doesn't matter how content is viewed, the content is still what needs to be reviewed. The general public isn't smart enough to understand a difference between systems for different media, so the same systems, guidelines and markings need to be used for all classified media.

Q23:

Of course. Content is content, and that is what should be classified - not the form of media. When people view media, they are massively affected by it (even without realising it) regardless of whether it is a movie or a game.

Q24:

None. There are things that we wish weren't online, but once the government starts prohibiting some topics, they will continue to try prohibiting the other topics they want banned, such as euthanasia. We have every right to view political content that our government does not agree with. The worst topics, such as child porn, usually aren't even shared online - pedophiles share this content over things like peer to peer systems, meaning an internet filter will have little effect.

Q25:

I don't think we should be filtering the internet.

Q26:

Yes, because people moving between states expect ratings to stay the same and it is completely unnecessary to have to learn separate systems. Surely if all states have the same laws, it would be a waste of money to promote it - when you go to another state, you see the same system and already know it - you don't need to be told that they have the same system. It's obvious.

Q27:

Something closer to the UK or US systems, where simple markings and a wider difference in age categories make it much easier to understand. Also, games should have an R rating (as they do in most countries), since content rated R in most countries somehow skims through to an MA rating, meaning 15 year olds (and younger because parents don't understand the difference in M and MA) access content unsuitable for them.

Q28:

Probably

Q29:

The need for an R rating for games is such an important issue, as teens are currently able to access content that is rated 18+ everywhere else. People seem scared of an onslaught of "adult games", scared of things like porn games - these don't exist, except for maybe a tiny few in Japan (which don't get exported as it would make no sense financially, as Japan is the only place with that market). We don't want an R rating for games to see more adult content - we want an R rating for games to protect the young! Adult content is fitting into lower categories and the current system allowing this is not protecting teens. Also, parents often misunderstand that there is a big difference between M and MA. Buying an MA movie/game for your teen doesn't seem like a big deal to most, many people think "my kid is almost 15, near enough is close enough". However, it would seem a big deal to buy an R game for your teen! It is so obvious that an R rating on games would PROTECT the young.

Other comments: