

CI 372 G Mills

First name: Grant

Last name: Mills

Q1:

Provisions for an Adult classification (R 18+) for computer and console games need to be included in any future framework. As the current framework only allows recourse to ban any game that is too explicit for the MA 15+ rating it seems that a new framework which incorporates the fact that there are age and maturity groups beyond the age of 15 needs to be developed.

Q2:

Classification is an extremely important social requirement and I believe generally works very well. The objectives should remain at protecting children and teenagers of certain ages from exposure to subjects harmful to them. If anything these need to be more forcefully enforced and watched. But the classification scheme has to evolve with the media landscape making room for things, such as video games, without curtailing the population's right, and games designers' aspirations.

The classification schemes should also include a mandate that educates parents and guardians the nature of classification. I think that classification is not taken as seriously as it should be and that parents' lack of controls are rendering classification ineffective.

Q3:

Technology or platform should only be taken into consideration only so much as it changes the relative effect on the audience/participant. Arguments suggest that interactive gaming has more effect on people than watching. Numerous studies have concluded this BUT research is generally focused on the reaction of children and young adults at developmental ages, emphasising negative changes in their behaviour.

Adults are a different matter altogether and the two should not be confused. Studies on children misrepresent the argument as a whole.

Mimicry by children is to be expected if exposed to violence in video games - this is how children learn and set their socially acceptable boundaries - and this is no different to being exposed to negative stereotypes on TV or the anti-social behaviour of their parents.

Studies on adults do not come to the same conclusion. As with art, TV and movies children should be protected from harmful exposure, and video games need to be given the same respect and breadth of classification. By banning games that do not fit the current categories adults are not being given the rights to choose that they are being given in other aspects of their lives.

Q4:

Yes, high-risk content needs to be classified but a system could be put in place that takes into consideration other countries' classification of the material and which allows the material to by-pass

classification.

Though this hind-sight classification for content that receives a complaint could make for painful and costly withdrawals from public consumption 'pending classification review'.

Q5:

Yes potential for impact, particularly concerning children needs to be reviewed across ALL media

Q6:

Producers and distributors should not make a difference, classification should be decided on potential impact only.

Q7:

A difficult topic. I don't think art should be classified at all. But there has to be a responsibility of care by the artist and exhibitors to ensure that the audience is aware of any potential negative impact.

Q8:

Music and audiobooks should only be classified for audience awareness. Regulation of things like music or books, with the reserved power to censor such materials should not be allowed.

Q9:

Taking into account size of audience, be it large or small, should not be taken into account lest some things not receive classification because the audience is minor and other things receive classification faster, or by different standards because the audience is large

Q10:

No

Q11:

-

Q12:

An internet censorship scheme would be ineffective and useless. Parental awareness and potentially mandatory parental controls are options for keeping undesirable material out of children's hands. State control of content accessibly by adults should be out of the question.

Q13:

Parental filters need to be developed that integrate with the online environment but parents need to be empowered to be more active and involved in their child's online life.

Q14:

I don't think this has been a problem under the current system

Q15:

Age restricted material should display warnings. But more emphasis has to be made to people of the

relevance of those warnings as I think society is largely numb to them now

Q16:

Q17:

I think that it would be valuable for industry to have more of a say in the classification proceedings but with limits on the power they have. Too often the classification board seems too distanced and out of touch.

Q18:

Q19:

The classification and release of content should be paramount and there should definitely be recourse to funding for people unable to subsidise it themselves

Q20:

Current ones are straightforward and simple enough. The importance is in extending the classifications afforded to video games and emphasising to parents the importance of heeding the warnings

Q21:

I think you know where I stand on this. TV and movies have a R18+ category. Australia needs to institute one for video games to bring it in line with the modern world

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Child pornography. Though there are many other things worth banning, everything else lives in a grey area of rights and freedom of expression. Until the government can unequivocally prove that any censorship and remote bans would not stifle the rights of legitimate people and legitimate expression then there should be no blanket censorship. The exception of course is child pornography where any whiff of such a thing should condemn a site.

Q25:

No - The refused classification category needs review as it has not adequately evolved with the times and modern media.

Q26:

-

Q27:

-

Q28:

Consultation should lead to a unified framework that can be applied nationwide

Q29: