

CI 827 J Thomas

First name: Jade

Last name: Thomas

Q1:

A new framework.

Q2:

A more consistent system which relies on content rather than the possibility of perceived audience impact through interactivity; the creation of an R18+ rating across all forms of media, allowing consistency within the system.

Q3:

No.

Q4:

No, as this would undermine the purpose of a classification system: it would not allow people to immediately gauge whether content is appropriate for their age, or the age of their children, etcetera.

Q5:

Impact is too subjective to be a major criteria for classification: such criteria can create instability in the classification system. Fair ratings can only be achieved when the content is viewed objectively. Content for children should be marked as such and classified, allowing parents to ensure that children are only exposed to age-appropriate material.

Q6:

No, as this would lead to confusion regarding how 'influential' or 'mainstream' a product must be before it is classified. A fair system must not be based around fluctuating factors such as market position and size of the media production companies.

Q7:

Q8:

It would be difficult to classify products that are simply aural with the same system that is used to classify products with aural and visual components, such as films, television and video games. A separate system, such as the one that is already in use for music, seems to work appropriately already.

Q9:

No, as classification should be applied fairly and across the board to all media of similar make-up.

Q10:

No, as the audience must always be informed and/or protected, whether they intend to consume the product in public or private. This is yet another proposal that could hurt the stability and consistency of

the classification system.

Q11:

Q12:

An entirely voluntary filter that parents can choose to install to their browsers, though any form of internet censorship can easily be bypassed with simple knowledge. It is nearly impossible to control internet access at this point in time, without severely harming innocent users.

Q13:

Voluntary internet filters that parents can install, and parent vigilance of their child's internet use. Other methods have too many negatives to be considered productive.

Q14:

This is a matter of parent vigilance. The government can and should only control the initial sale and store display.

Q15:

At all times so that all content, from child-appropriate to adults-only, can be easily separated from the mass of products on the market.

Q16:

Government agencies should provide the framework for regulation, industry bodies should work to uphold the framework, and users should maintain vigilance so that the content does not accidentally fall into inappropriate hands when it is taken into the home or public arena.

Q17:

No, as this undermines consistency among the different industries and media forms.

Q18:

Adult-only content, as this is immediately obvious in terms of classification.

Q19:

Q20:

There is some confusion between the M15+ and MA15+ ratings, but for the most part the categories are clear. However, the distinct lack of an R18+ rating for video game media causes confusion, as it creates inconsistencies within the overall classification system.

Q21:

Yes, video game media should be allowed to have an R18+ rating so that film, television and games are consistently classified.

Q22:

If the system itself is consistent across the main forms of video-related media, then the markings, criteria and guidelines should automatically be consistent.

Q23:

I do not have the knowledge to comment appropriately here.

Q24:

It is too difficult to prohibit online content without accidentally prohibiting innocent content, as the internet moves too quickly for filters to track.

Q25:

No.

Q26:

Yes, classification should be consistent across all states. It should not rely on the attorney-generals, but rather on the federal parliament. The current system gives individuals too much power in terms of classification categories, as was seen with Attorney-General Michael Atkinson and his repeated efforts to block an R18+ rating for video games.

Q27:

A solely Commonwealth scheme that is consistent across all of Australia.

Q28:

Yes. It is too easy for content to cross state boundaries, making a state-by-state system ineffective in controlling access to restricted content.

Q29:

By allowing individuals to make their own choices when it comes to 'adult' content, rather than banning it completely, as is seen in the case of video games.

Other comments:

The fact that video games do not have a classification system that is consistent with film and television isn't appropriate for this modern age. Gaming is a growing industry that is no longer the sole realm of children and teenagers, and as such adults should be able to access content that is aimed towards them. Adult content must be kept from children, yes, but it should not automatically be kept from adults as well.

The current system is inconsistent and unstable, which merely means that people are less likely to listen to the warnings of classification. Also, it is simple to import banned video games from overseas. By bringing our classification system into line with that of other developed nations, consumers might be more likely to buy from Australian retailers, rather than American or European retailers online.