CI 351 A Clark

First name: Aiden

Last name: Clark

Q1:

The framework should be expanded to include and separate what could be classified as acceptable for a "teenage" audience, versus what should not be acceptable for even that. Because even with a ban on video games, I still see illegally imported or downloaded videogames in teenage or children's rooms. Their parents unaware exactly how extreme these are when their children buy or download them because they are unrated here. Also, at 25 I still play video games and perhaps will for the foreseeable future. Why am I giving up my freedom because there isn't a classification that makes videogames suitable for me?

Q2:

Primary objective? There are several objectives.
1) Classification scheme should be to educate.
2) Classification scheme should be to inhibit purchasing or owning.
3) Classification scheme should be based around factual evidence from worldwide sources. Statistics that suggest that there is correlation between violence and videogames often are contradicted by other statistics of the same. Meaning that study of the people involved are likely just as telling on how influential a videogame might be on a person. These studies need to be undertaken by the government, and found which types of violence, which types of adult themes are actually influential. Would you say street racing has increased because of a gross abundance of videogames based on driving since then 90s? Or would you attribute street racing culture to the increased availability of car performance parts at low prices? Simplifying only reduces the effectiveness of the scheme and makes less people respect it. By reducing respect, less people will follow the scheme and more people will make their own minds up about how much they should

Q3:

Online platforms for distribution of videogames provide the exact same product. These should be classified the same. However, there are platforms for downloadable content, which might be added on existing content, these should be classified separately. These are purely optional and if they weren't accessible to some audiences because their classification deems them so, then that is acceptable too.

Q4:

I believe that complaints are outliers usually. They rarely fall into the consensus of what the society feels is a ethical agreeable level. These complaints should largely be dealt with politically rather than bending the scheme. Bending a scheme to suit individuals will only make the scheme less reputable and therefore it'll lose weight as a tool for education.

When classification happens it should be done with benchmarks so that consistency can be

established. Even if someone does not agree with where the scheme has placed a barrier, they can still rely on the consistency of the scheme to still use it as a guide and then make the changes they think are appropriate to them to decide what is and isn't acceptable.

When things are reviewed they should be reviewed against those benchmarks to ascertain that there have been no mistakes or oversights when classifying content such that when they re-classify it, those who would question why, can see the justification.

Q5:

Two questions are here.
THe impact of content should be assessed by benchmarks and rated accordingly. The benchmarks need to be as complete as possible to include even things like certain themes which would might have more of an impact then say gore or unacceptable behaviour.
Even educational and childrens rated things should be classified exactly as such. Educational materials need rating too, because what is acceptable to learn in year 5 might not be acceptable to learn in year 3. In year 5 you educationally witness nudity to lean about sex, however being exposed to that too early or too late would be bad.

Q6:

This seems like a self serving question. Hardly worth answering. No.

Q7:

I believe that it could be more relaxed in some situations in accordance to promote the finer arts and freedom of speech. However, art sometimes aimed at teenagers and young adults, like all art, is an expression of their self, and their thoughts, which might include themes not acceptable to all children. Smut can still be art if it is represented in a way that exposes weakness in character and so on, however those themes are not always acceptable to younger minds who would have trouble understanding it's extent. There are some kinds of arts that have to be understood to be appreciated and they should be classified as such, not to impede their freedom of speech but to protect innocence. However you may still be fairly liberal while doing this, because if a younger person is already interested in those things, it could be a sign that they understand them already. Everybody matures differently after all.

Q8:

Naturally. Rating something equal to the wiggles which has messages and themes as tough as a death metal band won't make sense. Although it's highly unlikely that they would be mistaken. But a classification scheme should be a benchmark. Music is highly influential but in being influential it also helps build both character and understanding for different types of people. These things should be rated to allow a consistent benchmark.

Q9:

All things should be classified, if it's for everybody, then Everybody should be it's classification. If society already deems it acceptable, and the classification says that society is wrong, then the

classification needs to be reassessed. No one would respect a classification scheme that doesn't reflect societal ethics.

Q10:

I can't understand this question. I'd need an example to understand what you mean. I can't think of instances where a band wouldn't make an album, or a movie wouldn't be released to DVD. There is an effect that groups have on an individual when interpreting, however, that group should still roughly be a reflection of society. As such, if the classification reflects society's ethics, then in turn it should be correct for the group, and also the individual. Instead, the classification shouldn't be to classify them different. Instead which classification would be okay for public? In a public venue accessible to all people, then what is shown/displayed should be no higher than a rating for everyone. However, in a restricted environment like a show ground, sports match, or movie theatre, then what can be shown should be restricted by the event holder.

So in short, if the classification is right for providing a general idea of acceptability for society, then no changes should be made for public or private, only instead a restriction of what is displayed should be restricted, based on the classification.

Q11:

Classification should be a reflection of society ethics. Anything else would be seen as some kind of politics and therefore it would lose it's applicability to life. I hate already that this nanny state would rather force it's people to change, rather than grow with the will of it's people. It seems to me that the government doesn't believe that people are good, and that they have a duty to make them better. I believe this oppression is wrong ethically. From making a filter which has not been classified in any measurable terms to "reducing" binge drinking by increasing alcohol prices. All of which will be ineffective to solving the troubles that they aim to solve. However the classification scheme shouldn't be able to change habits, but instead it should be an educational tool for people to more easily assess the content they could consider to purchase. By giving the power to the individual to make better decisions, they will make better decisions. It's only a lack of information that will stop a person from making good decisions.

Q12:

Education. How much online content actually needs restriction? Out of our population only those between years 0-18 would want to have any content restricted while they still are learning to become an adult. So the most effective method would be education of parents. These parents probably won't need to control their children until they are probably 4 years old.

So then, to do that, give parents tools to do it. I believe filtering the internet is wrong. Would you break off the penis on the statue of david because a 4yo child could see it? Or would you put it somewhere that perhaps instead 4yo's wouldn't see it until they were older, like a museum. The filter is easily worked around by the exact same methods that were undertaken by the teenagers interviewed when the Howard government gave out free internet filtering software.

Children when they are dedicated to learning, will learn. Even when you don't want them to they if they care about it, will find a way around it. Therefore you have to make parents responsible. Parents are the reason they are there and they will be responsible for all kinds of things. Not to mention that you can never fully protect a child. You have to also expect that the parents and teachers will give the tools the children need to understand even if they ever came across something they shouldn't.

Q13:

Parents.

Q14:

Parents. Those magazines are pretty clearly explained to be not acceptable to children, so if a child takes it, he should be punished if his parents do not agree with it. I was. I grew up ok. There was no filter in my life and I've seen everything the internet has. I still think people are good people. Yet I've met in my lifetime people who have lived in places without the internet and they are not okay. Therefore the internet good and bad doesn't necessarily make a negative influence. However I had even by the age of 8 a good understanding of what was right and worng. Using that sense when I came across something I knew was wrong, I understood it was undesireable. Therefore it solidified my understanding of why it's not acceptable. There is a convergence and divergence theory, if parents, teachers, and society have done their job correctly, then things which are acceptable they'll converge to, and things that are not acceptable, they'll diverge from.

Q15:

Do you mean what content should and what content shouldn't? Marketing departments would have a better idea of when. They'll tell you the most effective psychological point to display the classification markings. Personally in "when" it'd be before the content is delivered at all. Even on propaganda it'd be best to display the warning then along with the advertisement. It should be understood before even advertised to, what kind of audience this is acceptable for.

Q16:

Benchmarks, teachers, enforcers. They should analyze and have benchmarks which the benchmarks themselves are available and open so that people can understand the rational decision making. The teachers should be the point where the classification is taught to the society such that they can understand it's role and limitation, and enforces should be for enforcing companies to stand by these classifications.

Q17:

Yes at this point. Because of their market research they understand demographics better than even the government. They would be greedy and try to give things to some people before they would socially be ready for it too. It's not ideal but the current system has little to no reputation and parents, teenagers and children mostly ignore the rating system. Instead they already just buy into the marketing if it suits their interest. Which means that marketing is the current "classification".

Q18:

Probably none. But if you were, and the bechmarks have been open and lain out clearly and straightforward then if they did and it deviated from the benchmarks then I believe the public would quickly be up in arms. So in some ways, the most important thing is having a solid benchmark. Benchmark will mean a good reputation.

Q19:

Nope. If a benchmark is bent, then it loses credibility. However if you understand that the classification is educational, to explain what you could expect in a film, then classifying it correctly is still fine. Those who are ready to see those themes should still see them despite being classified. Those individuals who would see it anyway, under supervision or approval of their parents etc, are liekly already to understand the themes. You won't get someone who isn't interested in those themes in an indepentent film festival, it's natural selection.

Q20:

They're mostly understood. But considering that everyone watches whatever they want anyway, they aren't meaningful past a few points. My parents didn't let me watch m15 till i was about 13~ and only a few movies specifically (action ones mostly). Then they didn't let me watch R18 till i was 16 and then only specific ones (usually the sexual ones.. by 16 you're pretty used to sex). So i could say they are understood, my friends and my family understand them. The one thing that no-one understands is "unclassified". For some reason while no one listens to the ratings, we take it a little as "Advice" if the government doesn't want people to see, then they do not classify it. And then it seems like it's illegal. Even though there are many people who could watch/read/play those things. This seems outside of the purpose of the classification scheme. Where as it was a guide before, it suddenly when it doesn't classify, instead of being a guide, becomes the law. That doesn't make sense. No one can explain to me, and I can't explain to anyone, how a body designed to give parents a guide, suddenly becomes powerful enough to literally make some things illegal.

Q21:

Clearly a body for classification should not be able to make things illegal. The whole system needs to be overhauled. There also should be a difference between PG and PG13. Between the ages of 6-16 a child and later, teenager, learns so many things about society. Even in a single year their view of social correctness would change quite drastically, and their understanding of themes too just as much if not more. Therefore what is acceptable at below 13 and above 13 is very different and parents are adjusting to their children even more often than every few years. They need classifications to help them, Even though there is; E,G,PG,M15,R18 there's really only about 3 that matter (for intuitive reasons), PG,M,R. This would suggest that parents who revolved around only 3 classifications, although that isn't reflective of the themes that is acceptable or their children are ready or already experiencing.

Q22:

Benchmark. A benchmark with many criteria that results in an outcome of a rating. The benchmark should be justified by papers and documentation of a result of community input and statistical research along with psychologist input and media authorities. Once the benchmark is decided on,

those who want to classify something should refer to the benchmark. Those who disagree with a classification, should use the benchmark.

The benchmark should be comprehensive. That is, obviously videogames are to some degree different to movies in some cases. The violence in a videogame can last tens of hours not just an hour and a half like a movie. So defining that difference might be important. However the violence of an animated videogame could be significantly less realistic than a movie. But I'm not talking about one or two things, I'm talking about a large broad overview which can define and justify why the rating system is consistent. It should be able to rate everything such that at the end of the day it's a PG because of X factors. Once established the benchmark can be changed as changes in statistics are found, perhaps things removed or added but ammendments based on logical choices. The benchmark should be open so all can see and discriminate. It's their choice to follow the guideline, but the benchmark should still give them a solid idea of what they are to expect.

Q23:

One benchmark. Once benchmark is made. Then there's no reason for segregating the benchmark.

Q24:

Nothing. There are bad things, they should be dealt with by the law. A patchwork system to arbitrarily close bits of the internet is flawed and will only highlight failings. Use the resources to protect children locally by stopping the awful things that happen to them here, rather than pretend they're only on the internet.

Q25:

Nope. The RC is shit. It's about as arbitrary as it gets. Mortal Kombat was RC and it's the biggest joke of a game I've seen. Have you seen saw? any of them? A person who threw up watching those would probably laugh at how cartoonish and ludicrous mortal kombat is. Proof that the system is arbitrary and pointless.

Q26:

Yes. Promoted? Why not just run a federal level classification scheme, and then that way once the benchmark is made all people can put forward studies and ethical reasons for change. Individual states being different just makes the system seem arbitrary and reduces it's worth.

Q27:

I don't have time for this.

Q28:

Yes, but only once the benchmark I've mentioned repeatedly exists.

Q29:

A BENCHMARK. Read the above 27 questions to find out my feelings about how important a benchmark is.

Other comments: