

CI 1788 K Thomson

First name: Kahlee

Last name: Thomson

Q1:

A new framework should be developed which identifies that different types of media require different classification. For example, a live-action film may generate more emotion than a video game, due to the ability to recognise characters as being human. Alternatively, an animated film with unrealistic characters is easier to discern as fictional than a video game with high-quality graphics and a realistic plot and storyline. With extremely rapid advances in technology, the subtle but key differences in media need to be addressed during classification.

Q2:

The classification scheme should allow the public to make informed choices about content, rather than restrict access (other than due to age). It is important to ensure that children cannot access materials which are deemed only suitable for adults, however, this restriction should not stop adults from accessing these materials when they are fully aware of the contents.

Q3:

To a degree. Answering this with a 'yes' would leave all methods of communication open to classification (e.g. the Internet, private networks, private telephone conversations, picture messaging, which would lead to mobile phones having to be classified). However, the technology does need to be considered. A fantasy video game with mythical creatures and humanoid races is very identifiable as being fictitious, compared to a film with a realistic plot and human actors. Conversely, a realistic video game with a plausible plot is more identifiable than an animated film with talking animals. Perhaps what is more vital is the element of realism, compared to the technology or platform, but it should be considered only partly.

Q4:

It is important to classify content to allow consumers to be fully aware of what they are accessing or viewing. Classification, however, is time consuming and classifying all materials would lead to the delays of materials being published. Alternatively, an "unclassified" category is highly preferable to a "refused classification" category, as it would inform consumers of the risks of the material and why it has not yet been classified, but still allow access. It is perhaps important that only adults should have access to "unclassified" materials. In short, yes. If it's managed properly.

Q5:

If children are the target audience it is important for this to be fully classified as adults need to ensure they are making the right choices for their children. If children are not the target audience, it is important that this is communicated - not necessarily a classification.

Q6:

This also comes under the question of whether content should be classified based on medium/technology. One could claim that a website has the potential to reach all persons of the world who have Internet access, but in reality only a few thousand people might actually stumble upon the website. Forcing producers to have their content undergo classification could lead to it being almost

impossible to start a new web venture or produce a movie solely to be released online. It's important for consumers to be made aware of content but forcing classification upon every item based on potential market reach is unrealistic.

Q7:

For some reason, the idea of classifying artworks (assuming this question is referring to traditional art - paintings, photography, etc) upsets me. Perhaps it's because the whole idea of art is to challenge emotion. Where would the line be drawn - would artworks containing nudity have to be censored if it was possible that children could view them? As merely a method of providing consumer advice, this could work, but it means that artwork has to be judged on how much it could potentially offend an audience, which is always subjective.

Q8:

Perhaps in the same way as film.

Q9:

Same as Q6: This also comes under the question of whether content should be classified based on medium/technology. One could claim that a website has the potential to reach all persons of the world who have Internet access, but in reality only a few thousand people might actually stumble upon the website. Forcing producers to have their content undergo classification could lead to it being almost impossible to start a new web venture or produce a movie solely to be released online. It's important for consumers to be made aware of content but forcing classification upon every item based on potential market reach is unrealistic.

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Simple - don't. Online content should not be controlled by government authorities. I can't argue too much about clearly illegal materials (such as child pornography) but even then, restricting online content will force offenders to use other, less traceable means of transmitting these illegal materials, which means police investigations are all the more difficult. I'd rather see offenders caught and prosecuted and government funds go into methods of catching the suppliers of these illegal materials, than have a giant curtain put over it.

Q13:

Parents. It's really not that difficult, parents just need to monitor what their children do online. Simple answer is to have the family computer in a living room or other open area of the family home, NOT the child's bedroom. I grew up online during the early stages of the web, and my parents (who can't even access their own email) knew they had to watch me when I accessed chat rooms and browsed the web. Controlling of this content should NOT be handled by the government - it is distinctively the responsibility of the parents to educate their children and monitor them when appropriate.

Q14:

I'm not sure it should be. Sealed packaging, consumer advice warning, and not being sold to people under 18, this already takes place.

Q15:

Q16:

Advice - that is all. Consumers need to be free to make their own choices and access what they wish, it is not up to the government to dictate what consenting adults can and cannot access. The only thing these bodies/agencies should do is provide advice and restrict people under 18 years old from making purchases in stores.

Q17:

Probably not, would just make things more complex.

Q18:

Q19:

Anything made with a budget of under a specific amount, which is subject to classification. Even further, anything under a smaller budget should be entirely free (if classification is forced upon it). Classifying things such as websites would lead to a drastic drop in the development of online content, and often this is developed at very low budgets. By forcing classifications on these materials, the creation of new content would be almost non-existent.

Q20:

Refused classification. This indicates that material is entirely unsuitable for any consenting adults to access, which is not a fair judgement for a government agency to make.

Additionally, M15+ category for video games. Many games which SHOULD have a rating of R18+ are being forced into this category, which is allowing children to purchase these games and parents thinking they are suitable for their children, when really the content is not.

Also, what's the difference between M and MA15+?

Q21:

Yes, an R18+ category is definitely needed for video games. "Refused classification" should be removed entirely, and replaced with an "Unclassified" category which only adults 18+ can purchase. Currently, many video games which are rated R18+ in other countries are being toned down only slightly (or not at all) and forced into the M15+ category - video games which children under 18 should NOT be accessing.

Q22:

The same classification categories need to exist for any material which is to be classified, e.g. R18+ exists for movies, but not for video games.

Q23:

Q24:

None. Perhaps child pornography, but even then I'd rather see the funding go to police operations to catch these criminals than to just put a big black curtain over it and say it doesn't exist anymore.

Q25:

Refused Classification should not exist. It is entirely inappropriate to tell adults what they can and cannot access, as long as it is legal. Why should it be legal for movies to include violence but not online content? The scope should be reduced and be consistent across all media.

Q26:

Q27:

A standard legislation which forces standard categories across all media (which will be classified).

Q28:

Q29:

R18+ rating for video games (and removal of the "refused classification" category) and more focus on parental responsibilities is essential, as stated in the above answers.

Other comments:

R18+ rating for video games (and removal of the "refused classification" category) and more focus on parental responsibilities is essential, as stated in the above answers.