

CI 2315 L Dwyer

First name: Luke

Last name: Dwyer

Q1:

Improve key elements, the current rating system is fine but needs to be able to include content which is appropriate for adults only.

Q2:

The primary objective should be to objectively inform people about the appropriate age someone should be before accessing material. This is important on both a consumer level and a business level. As an example, content which really deserves to be fit into an R18+ rating will currently be refused classification until it can only just barely pass as MA15+. This in turn gives people under the intended age access to material the developers never intended.

Q3:

I don't believe so, the content needs to have an age classification regardless of how it is accessed.

Q4:

No, content needs to be classified regardless in order for the informative aspects of the classification system to work properly

Q5:

No, content should be classified regardless, the impact the content may or may not have should only help to determine which classification the media falls under. All content should be classified.

Q6:

Size should not matter, nor should it cause any influence to the matter of what rating the media falls under. If the size of the market ends up influencing the classification then the system will lose it's objectivity and will not perform as intended.

Q7:

Artwork should still require classification, however art tends to be more lax in it's classification of things such as nudity as they are often not portrayed in a sexual manner.

Q8:

Yes, as music and other sound recordings become more easily accessible to people of all ages, it should be a requirement that these forms of media are also classified correctly.

Q9:

Same response as question 6; if the size of the market influences the classification, then the system becomes nonobjective and becomes open to bullying and bargaining.

Q10:

No, classification should only be used as a reference for people to correctly judge whether the content is appropriate for certain audiences. Given that most content is able to be accessed in public in one manner or another, it should not influence the classification.

Q11:

The only factor which should influence the rating of the content is the content itself. People need to be able to make informed decisions about whether the content is appropriate for their intended use. By

influencing the classification with other arbitrary variables, the ultimate purpose of the classification system becomes defunct.

Q12:

Information regarding online monitoring services, such as net nanny or an option for users to opt into an internet filtering system through their ISP.

Q13:

Online monitoring systems would be appropriate. A potential workaround would be for users to opt in to an ISP website filtering service, whereby key words are searched for in urls of websites to alert users when an inappropriate website has been accessed.

Q14:

Q15:

When the need is required, obviously if one is in an adult store the need for warning labels is fairly redundant. However if the material is available to the general public and the need for information is required, then the appropriate information should be delivered. This is pretty much what is already in place, however in situations where material has particularly strong themes, it may be necessary to communicate examples of the content so that consumers can accurately grasp the nature of what they are accessing.

Q16:

Industries should properly and clearly highlight all aspects of the media which would influence the rating classification of their media. Governments should thoroughly examine this material (with no subjectivity) to ensure that nothing has been missed and that the industries are accurately representing their material. The consumer should be responsible make their own decisions based on clear guidelines on media and to be accountable for who accesses the content in their home.

Q17:

A team of people highly familiar with both aspects of the media and the classification system would be the best solution to provide a classification system. By ensuring that the team is not only familiar with the content but also responsible enough to make objective decisions about who the media is appropriate for, we are able to best represent what the media conveys and to which audience it would best be suited for. A team to review these decisions would be a good option also.

Q18:

I believe all content should be at least checked to ensure that nothing which is inappropriate for it's intended audiences slips through, but some content which has already received a classification internationally from a recognized body could be rated to the same standard locally.

Q19:

No, the classification is designed to be able to objectively inform viewers what content the media contains as well as the recommended age bracket. No matter what size the market is, the classification should not deviate from it's objectivity. As mentioned earlier, a team specialized to each area of media would not only be able to more accurately classify media, but to be aware of their release to the public.

Q20:

The classification system does successfully give people an idea of what the media contains, however the message can be overlooked as the categories are often too broad. People often don't distinguish

a M15+ classification from an MA15+, coupled with the fact that some content is only just squeezed into the MA15+ category, you've got some small circumstances where the classification system doesn't perform as intended.

Q21:

I believe that two 15+ ratings causes confusion, the removal of the M and MA system would provide more clarity for people to judge the appropriateness of content. G is very clear in that anyone can watch it without any worry, PG is also clear enough in that people below 15 may require supervision, however it is a big jump between material that may have the potential to have slightly strong content to M15+ which determinately has strong content. The introduction of a rating in between would allow media to be more accurately classified.

Q22:

By following the example of international rating systems we may be able to reduce the confusion of the globalization of media through the internet.

Q23:

Due to the different delivery method of all media a system which has a uniform rating classification would be beneficial, however classification criteria should be different for each medium in order for a classification decision to be made.

Q24:

I don't believe a prohibition system would function as intended, the people who want to access certain websites will find the ability to access these regardless of whether it is blocked or not. I believe a voluntary system should be created for people to opt into in order to protect audiences from accessing content that is not appropriate, whether this is completed by informing people about existing filtering services or by creating a service for users to opt into.

Q25:

Q26:

A country-wide classification system would be beneficial as a different classification set-up for each state would cloud the judgement of users.

Q27:

I believe a system which does not ban material from the country, but rather more accurately reflects the nature of the media should be implemented.

Q28:

I believe Australia should be able to come up with it's own classification system, delegating the work to the Commonwealth could result in Australians not getting the results they were hoping for.

Q29:

Less about banning material, more about improving communication between media and intended audiences.

Other comments:

That was a long bloody submission.