CI 91 P Boyd

First name: Pip
Last name: Boyd

Q1:

Q2: Protection of children, young people and sensitive parties, eg women who
have suffered the realities of what can be depicted on screen as
'enterainment.' To uphold the rights and values of all members of society, eg.
to decrease objectification of women, exposure to violence etc.

Q3: Not at all. That would inevitably mean that those who seek to use
classifications for the above protective purposes would have a high chance of
being exposed without their will to content protected by a loophole they were
unaware or opposed to.

Q4: No. People use classification as a guide to whether they expose themselves
to certain content in the first place. To remove the classification until
complaint defeats the purpose of classification altogether.

Q5: Yes.

Q6: NOT AT ALL. Harmful content is harmful content. I believe classification
is not so much used by the mass of general public but for the minority who
seek to protect themselves and their children from specific content. You can
make educated guesses as to who will be affected but no more than that, and so
a constant consistant classification is the only effective method.

Q7: Unsure - probably only to some. I personally would appreciate pre-warning
of artwork where children have been sexualised or that contain scenes of
violence to women but I also believe artwork is too subjective to be put under
much general classification - people have to many different contexts under
which they create and view art.

Q8: Yes.

Q9: No. See Q6

Q10: No. Content that is accessible at home can & will be viewed in public and
vice versa whether a regulatory body says so or not. There is no ultimate
difference.

Q11:

Q12:

Q13: Better parental education as to exactly what their children can and are
accessing on line to create accountability.

Q14:

Q15: When there is reasonable knowledge or expectation that children will be exposed to it, eg at the beginning of music video clips, and programs, on the cover of games/dvds/cds etc

Q16: Be responsible and accountable to label and restrict according to a strictly defined and publicly understood set of guidelines - which is NOT the case at the moment as I have discovered any complaint may be brushed aside by television networks if they deem harmful content is 'essential to the storyline' and classifications are frequently incomplete or misleading, and occasionally do not appear at all.

Q17: No. I believe as soon as the industry becomes responsible for itself there will be no such thing as effective classification - it is clearly not in the best interests of the industry to limit itself and chances to profit.

Q18: There is no such thing as obvious and straightforward in a diverse population. See Q17.

Q19:

Q20: No. Adult themes is almost meaningless as I am content varies so much under this heading.

Q21: Yes - I don't mind the M, MA etc system but the descriptives under each need to be more refined and descriptive and further description appearing on labels as reason for the classification

Q22:

Q23:

Q24: Child pornography or any content that sexualises children or contains sexual content aimed at a specifically young audience, "gonzo" pornography

Q25:

Q26: Yes.

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Other comments: