

CI 381 J Turnbull

First name: Jason

Last name: Turnbull

Q1:

The classification system for video games and related content in Australia needs an overhaul, in order to keep the thriving industry relevant in this country, and to keep us up-to-date with the rest of the world.

Q2:

A new classification scheme should indicate clear guidelines as to what is and is not appropriate for certain age groups. The primary objective in this scheme should be the introduction of an 18+ rating for video games in Australia that exceed the limits of the current MA15+ limit.

Q3:

No. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself.

Q4:

No. Content should be classified clearly from the start, to avoid the issue of complaint altogether. People should be informed of the type of content they will be viewing before they view it. Things like nudity, coarse language, drug use and violence should be included on the classification stamp on an item, much like they are now, relating to the classification given to the product. If you don't like what you see on the ratings label, don't view the product. Simple.

Q5:

Yes. Content deemed inappropriate for children and teenagers under the age of 18 should be classified and labeled accordingly, to prevent children from viewing inappropriate content, but still allow grown adults to make their own choices of what they would like to view.

Q6:

No. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media.

Q7:

Maybe. It depends on the artwork. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media. If you don't like it, don't look at it. If you don't want your children to look at it, don't let them look at it.

Q8:

No. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media. A warning label is suitable enough for music. If you don't like it, don't listen to it. Simple.

Q9:

No. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media

Q10:

No. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media

Q11:

Classification is important. Do not just start banning forms of media altogether. This will do nothing but hurt the industries involved.

Q12:

Parental locks on web browsers for families with children. A nationwide ban on certain internet content is absurd, and will only serve to destroy our freedom.

Q13:

Parental locks on web browsers, or content blocks provided by Internet Service Providers if requested by the account holder.

Q14:

This sort of material should be labeled clearly, with no graphically "offensive" material on the front cover, to avoid complaint.

Q15:

When necessary. If it has a classification, label it on the product.

Q16:

Content classification should be fairly regulated between different forms of media. Retailers must to adhere to these rules, or face consequences. If your staff are unaware of the content in a product they are selling, they need to be educated, or look for another job. Users (parents and children, for example) should be educated on the product they are buying, and why they have the classification they have been given.

Q17:

No. Consistency is crucial in this area, and is why this debate is happening in the first place. One body for classification, comprised on experts in the industries related to the product being classified.

Q18:

An R18+ classification for video games and other interactive content. The current classification scheme for video games in Australia is severely flawed when compared with other countries. Video games and content that have received an adults only rating (R18+) overseas have either been banned from Australia altogether, or been released with an MA15+ rating instead. This allows 15 year old children to legally purchase products which are clearly designed for adults, and also restricts mature adults from purchasing and viewing products that they are mature enough to access through

blatant censorship by refusing classification.

Q19:

For example, if a small independent film is being showed to a relatively small group of people, the publisher of the content should adhere to classifications themselves (which should be clearly outlined and easily accessible to the public), and inform those at the viewing, or be prepared to suffer the consequences. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media

Q20:

For the most part, yes. However, video gaming classification causes confusion with the majority of people, which is VERY clearly evident with certain groups and individuals protesting an 18+ rating. The current classification scheme for video games allows a maximum rating of MA15+. A lot of games released with this MA15+ rating SHOULD have been given an 18+ rating, therefore the current classification scheme is confusing and useless when an individual is to be making decisions on the content they are buying. With an R18+ classification introduced, the difference between what is appropriate for persons under the age of 18 becomes instantly clear, eliminating confusion, and providing clearer content description for parents, children, and the general public.

Q21:

Yes. Video games and interactive products should be classified consistently with other forms of media. There is only need for one addition to the video game classification system, being an R18+ rating, to protect children and better inform parents. The system should be:

G - General,

PG - Parental guidance recommended (age 13+),

MA 15+ - Mature audiences only (age 15+),

R 18+ - Restricted adult only content (age 18+)

It should be noted that I purposefully removed the standard M - Mature audiences rating from the list, purely because these products should probably fall under the MA rating anyway, and an extra rating in between PG and MA is unnecessary.

Q22:

All content should be labelled consistently, keeping the same standard symbols and lettering that we have now (green triangle for G, red square for MA 15+, black diamond for 18+ etc). A brief description of why the content has achieved certain classification should be displayed on the same label when necessary (mild violence, drug use, nudity, coarse language, horror etc).

Q23:

Absolutely yes. Content should be classified when necessary, based on the content itself, with one, clear guideline for all forms of media

Q24:

Adults should be free to view content as they please, with the obvious exclusion of illegal content (child pornography, for example). Children should be monitored or restricted by parents themselves, not nationally enforced rules.

Q25:

For the most part, yes. Education is the key here.

Q26:

Yes, absolutely. We are all one country, classification should be consistent throughout all states and territories, promoted by the same classification standards Australia wide.

Q27:

A scheme which ensures consistency with classification across all forms of media. Allowing adults to make informed and free choices on the content they wish to view, and preventing unauthorised content reaching minors. Photo identification should be required for products that require age verification. This should be enforced without discrimination, much like it is enforced when purchasing alcohol. If a child wishing to purchase an MA15+ movie or video game does not have appropriate and valid photo identification, they are to be refused service, for example. Photo identification should be provided by schools when children reach the age of 15.

Q28:

Yes, as mentioned in Q27.

Q29:

Consumers and industry bodies alike should be educated clearly on the classification system, and what is and is not appropriate. For example, retailers should be able to display accurate and extensive product knowledge when dealing with products that may be deemed inappropriate for children, even if for the purpose of informing parents. It may benefit retailers selling products with classification to display a ratings system information sheet or guide in store, accessible to all customers.

Other comments:

Adults deserve the right to access content as they see fit, depending on personal tastes, and not censorship. Children should be protected from content that is not appropriate to their age by providing content with a clear and consistent classification system, including an R18+ rating for our video game industry. The average age of video gamers in Australia is 30 years old, clearly indicating the need for a ratings system change that better accommodates the majority.