CI 531 T Kowalenko

First name: Tim

Last name: Kowalenko

Q1:

A complete overhaul of the classification system is needed. A system similar to the Pan European Game Information (PEGI) system would be far more effective.

Q2:

To provide people with clear concise information about the content of the media they are purchasing.

Q3:

Yes, if the platform already has a form of classification system in place (eg iTunes App Store) then it is a waste of time and taxpayers money to have material reclassified so that Australians can buy it.

Q4:

While this would be a nice idea in theory, it would not work very well in practice. So my answer has to be No.

Q5:

Yes, by using the PEGI System there are set descriptors for material that may be frightening or upsetting to young children. By using a system similar to PEGI then this information would be provided clearly for parents to make an informed decision

Q6:

No, all content should be classified equally. However, size and/or market position should affect the cost of having content classified. An 'Indie' or new publisher who has had zero, or very few publications classified, should pay less than a large, well established company.

Q7:

The most that should happen is to have a sign at the entrance of the exhibition that says something to the effect of "There is artwork in this exhibition that some people may find objectionable"

Q8:

Yes

Q9:

No

Q10:

Yes, content that is online only and not sold in retail stores should not be classified

Q11:

Q12:

Parents taking resonsibility

Q13:

By parents taking responsibility, such as installing and using parental controls (On both computer and games console. Yes, parental controls on consoles exist. It seems as though a majority of parents don't take enough interest in the technology, yet think it's everyones fault except their own when the tools are right there.

Q14:

By having the material in protective plastic, so that the title is visible and nothing else, and the content in plain sight of staff/the cashier.

Q15:

Content ratings and descriptors should be displayed on the front of the content so that it is immediately visible to whoever picks it up

Q16:

Government agencies should provide clear concise information to users about the content of material provided to them by Industry bodies. Also to provide industry bodies with information about what is and is not acceptable so that developers can ideally be classified the first time without needing to fix some aspects of the material and resubmit it.
Industry bodies should provide government agencies with a demonstration copy of the material with a list of everything that would fit into the descriptors of the system (eg Language, Violence etc)
Users should pay attention to the rating provided and make an informed decision based on that information. Users have no right to be annoyed when they find out that the Grand Theft Auto game their child asked them to buy has content that is by no means appropriate for them.

Q17:

Yes, this is an excellent idea.

Q18:

Ideally they should classify everything

Q19:

Yes, as I've mentioned earlier, new or 'Indie' developers should not have to pay the same price as a multi-million dollar company to have content classified.

Q20:

A majority of people seem to understand what the classification categories mean. Classification categories are immediately clear upon reading the label, however this does not appear to be very effective for people who only give the cover a cursory glance before buying it. To cite a real world example, a friend of my mothers mentioned that she bought a game for her nephew (Age 10), because he asked her for it, and was shocked to see how violent it was. I asked her why she bought him the game if it had the rating on the cover. Her response was "I thought M meant Mild"

Q21:

Classification categories that are very similar to the PEGI system should be more than enough (Violence, Language, Fear (Potentially frightening content), Sexual content, Drugs, Gambling, Discrimination, Online content)

Q22:

To have the labels in the same location across all classifed media would provide simple consistency so that consumers know where to look (ie Bottom left of the front cover)

Q23:

Yes, a complete overhaul of the Australian Classification System should be performed

Q24:

None. This is the point of the protest behind Stephen Conroys internet filter.

Q25:

No. Currently RC means "This game isn't suitable for somebody over the age of 15. Therefore, nobody can play it."

Q26:

Yes, if a particular state or territory (The people of the state/territory, not the Attorney-General acting out of their own opinion) do not want particular content (ie X-Rated material) then the content is simply not available for direct retail sale in that state/territroy, with people who do want that content free to import from another state if that is their decision.

Q27:

Q28:

No.

Q29:

By implementing a system similar to PEGI and removing the government aspect of classification, allowing the industry to classify itself with the government only stepping in when guidelines have been breached (eg Sexual content when sexual content is not on the classification)

Other comments: