CI 443 L Cawthron

First name: Lauren

Last name: Cawthron

Q1:

Q2:  To provide a concise and uniform standard by which to compare content so that consumers can make informed choices about what they buy. The scheme should focus on providing accurate information to the public rather than attempting to dictate what is appropriate for individuals to view or play in their own homes.

Q3: Yes, any content which may be displayed publicly or is designed for platforms used with TVs such as Xboxes, Playstations or Wiis may require warnings about the possibility of being innappropriate for those outside the target audience, even if they are not viewing or using the content themselves.

Q4: If content has been the subject of a complaint, it should be reviewed to determine whether the complaint was valid. Any content which deserves a mature rating or above should always be classified in order to give consumers enough information to make their own choice on whether or not it is suitable for their purposes.

Q5:

Yes, classification should be about informing consumers of offensive material, not what is 'right' or 'wrong'. Content designed for children should only need classification if it contains offensive material, but to me that seems unlikely.

Q6:

No, classification should be for the benefit of the consumer, not a publicity stunt or political statement. The number of people buying a game or film does not change the content.

Q7:

Some artworks may require classification if the content could be considered offensive to some, however, it should not be there for the purpose of restricting access, but to help viewers make informed choices as to whether it is appropriate for them and those in their care.

Q8:

Yes, there should be information available if the recordings contain foul language or cover subjects which may be innappropriate for some.

Q9:

No, the size of the audience will not change the content, and classifications help consumers to determine whether the product is appropriate for them. Just because the target audience would generally not have a problem with the content, the information should still be available for those who are not entirely certain.

Q10:

Public content such as advertising needs to take all possible audiences into account. Content such as movies should provide the same information about any offensive material, whether it is being shown in a theatre or a lounge room, so that people can make their own decisions about it.

Q11:

Q12:

Online content should not be restricted at all. What people do in the privacy of their own homes is entirely up to them. However, some pages should carry warnings if they would be considered innappropriate for people under 18, and those should not be accessable from public computers, such as internet cafes and libraries.

Q13:

That is up to the parent. Computers already have parental safeguarding options which can restrict a child's access to certain pages, and there is help available for parents who are unfamiliar with technology. No more needs to be done on the part of the government.

Q14:

Treat them much like games or movies when selling them. If a parent deems the content appropriate for their child, then that is up to them, but the simple answer is not to sell them to those under the recommended age for that content.

Q15:

Any content with a PG rating or above should display the classification and an accurate explanation as to why it was given. Modifiers such as mild or extreme should be used to indicate how severe or frequent the offensive content is so as to help buyers decide whether the material is appropriate for them.

Q16:

The government and industry must make sure that adequate information is given for consumers to make their own decisions about the material. Users must decide for themselves what they think is appropriate and when and how to keep content away from any in their care.

Q17:

Yes, right now classification of certain games is more lenient for publishers who can pay more to classify their own content. Because of this, independant publishers may be recieving harsher classifications for content which is on the same level as content from bigger corporations. Classifications should be about content, not profit.

Q18:

G and PG ratings only. If any content given a PG rating by the industry is found to actually require a mature rating, punishment such as fining should occur, and the material given a more accurate rating.

Q19:

Classification should be subsidised for independently-produced material and anything which is likely to recieve an MA rating or higher.

Q20:

The lack of an R18+ category is hindering our classifications system, as right now there are materials which probably belong in that category rated as MA15+ instead. If an R18+ category was introduced, it would prevent the leniency given to content in higher-rated categories from continuing, as those materials would no longer be misclassified in an attempt to allow them to be sold in Australia. This would also provide a more accurate scale with which consumers could measure content against in order to determine whether or not certain content is appropriate for them.

Q21:

Australia should have an R18+ classification category so that the system is more accurate and informative in order to allow users to decide for themselves whether or not certain content is appropriate for them. It is not up to the government to say what is appropriate for an individual, simply to ensure that enough information is given so that consumers may make informed choices. The lack of an R18+ category means that some content rated MA15+ may have a misleading rating because it was rated less harshly in order to be allowed to be sold in Australia.

Q22:

All media should be rated using the same standards by way of determining the frequency and how explicit potentially offensive material is. Markings are less important, as long as the rating and reasons for it are clearly visible.

Q23:

Q24:

No content should be entirely prohibited online, it is up to the individual what they access and why.

Q25:

Q26:

Yes, there should be a national standard for classifications, not a local one. Where a material is sold does not change the content.

Q27:

Q28:

Yes, a uniform policy for all of Australia to follow would be far better than different classification systems for different states.

Q29:

Other comments: