

CI 1793 N Nikolic

First name: Nina

Last name: Nikolic

Q1:

A new framework should be developed due to the omission of an R 18+ rating for games in the existing classification framework. Improvement of the existing framework will disregard this important aspect completely.

Q2:

To appropriately classify ALL forms of media, regardless of content (to the extent of bestiality, paedophilia, etc.) to protect minors from inappropriate content, but also to keep such content open for consumption by adults, whom should have the right to access such material.

Q3:

No.

Q4:

Yes, depending on the complaint. One person being sensitive about the content, if the content has clear disclaimers relating to offence that may occur to certain individuals, should definitely not be the grounds upon which it is classified differently or at all.

Q5:

Content designed for children should always be classified to give parents clear guidelines as to what to expect in the content of that media.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes for the purposes of consumer advice, not restricting content. Classifications should be used a guide . Again, dependant on the extent of themes in the content.

Q8:

Of course.

Q9:

Refer to Q6, no.

Q10:

Depending on extent of themes.

Q11:

What themes are included and the extent of these themes in the work.

Q12:

Not the most savvy person in this area ;)

Q13:

Better parenting.

Q14:

Better parenting. The only individuals I can see this affecting "negatively" is children, so it's once again up to the parents to monitor this as they see fit for their own children.

Q15:

Always. It's consumer advice! Even if the content only contains mild themes, it is helpful to individuals sensitive to various content as well as parents to gauge the appropriateness of the content for themselves and their children.

Q16:

Government agencies should monitor content of extremely questionable nature (beastiality, paedophilia, etc.), industry bodies (creators of the content and classification bodies alike) are expected to be responsible in the intended marketing and classifying of their material, and users should be expected to have common sense enough to take note of classification markings, warnings and consumer advice when deciding what content they wish to expose themselves to, failure to do so (if classifications and warnings are correctly adhered to) should be the fault of the user, not the creators or distributors.

Q17:

I believe so, various creative areas (film, game, art, etc.) can differ in their depiction of various themes, so co-regulatory models may be necessary to ensure that classification expectations are kept specific. Every piece of work is different, vague classification models + vague descriptions of content = mess.

Q18:

Anything that has themes extreme enough to warrant an R18+ rating but not require banning (beastiality, paedophilia, etc.). Pretty obvious.

Q19:

I'm not aware how this works in general.

Q20:

The lack of an R18+ classification for games causes enough confusion for parents to purchase games such as Alien Vs. Predator (MA15+) and Grand Theft Auto (MA15+) for their 12 year old children, which were previously banned for that same reason (to prevent access of minors to the content).

Q21:

R18+ for video games of similar standard to past games that have previously been banned and required unnecessary censorship to be branded an MA15+ rating for release in Australia.

Q22:

There will always be discrepancies between different types of media due to the level of involvement of the audience in that media (for example the high involvement in interactive mediums as opposed to artistic works). So it may become counterproductive to implement consistent criteria and guidelines across all fields.

Q23:

Possibly, so long as various classifications are treated specifically enough to their relative field based on Q22.

Q24:

Paedophilia, definitely. However there are artistic works (child nudes in photography, journalistic photography, etc) available online that are clearly not intended for the purposes of paedophilia. This type of content should be decided on what a reasonable person would believe the intent of the piece to be.

Q25:

"detailed instruction in crime, violence or drug use and/or material that advocates the doing of a terrorist act" These are areas that should be monitored by the law in ways other than their appearance in media to the general public. Reasonable persons should be able to differentiate between real life and their expectations in society, and the fantasies of of film, games etc. With the exception of documentaries that are intended for educating the public on the occurrence and reasoning of such matters (not to teach children how to hot-wire cars).

Child sexual abuse imagery and bestiality, however, are generally regarded as unacceptable by reasonable persons and would be better prohibited (keeping Q24 in mind).

Q26:

Yes, it is important if we wish for such creative industries to prosper on a nation-wide scale. It would also be unfair to limit access to material in certain states and territories, but not others. How would internet classification be managed if other content is not consistently classified?

Q27:

Not my area :)

Q28:

Enabling new framework legislation would be desired.

Q29:

Adding an R18+ rating for video games.

Other comments: