

TEMPLATE FOR MAKING SUBMISSIONS

PERSONAL INFORMATION¹:

*Name: Federal Church and Nation Committee
Presbyterian Church of Australia.*

Email address: [Convener]*

Gender: male*

Street Address:*

*Postal Address:
PO Box 273 Brighton South Australia .*

State/Postcode:_ postal 5048.*

Country of Residence: Australia.*

Age range: under 18/18-24/25-34/35-44/ 45-54/55-64/ 65+*

The denomination this committee represents would contain people with all those categories.

Do you play computer or video games? +yes no*

How frequently do you play?

Daily Weekly Fortnightly Monthly Other.....

How long do you play in an average session?

0-15minutes 15-30 minutes 30-60mins 1-2 hours 2+ hours

(Note: fields marked * are mandatory fields)

THE QUESTION

Should the Australian National Classification Scheme include an R18+ classification category for computer games?

NO

¹ Unless you clearly request confidentiality, **submissions are public documents** and may be accessed by any member of the public, may be published on the website and quoted in further review papers. If you do not want your submission to be published, or you would like to request anonymity, you must clearly request this is your submission.

ARGUMENTS

To help us understand your reasons for your answer, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following arguments:

- *Adults should not be prevented from playing R 18+ level computer games simply because they are unsuitable for minors*
1) **strongly disagree** 2) disagree, 3) do not know 4) agree 5) strongly agree
- *The R 18+ classification category sends a clear, unambiguous message to parents that the game material is unsuitable for minors*
1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) **agree** 5) strongly agree,
- *Consistent classification categories for films and computer games are easier to understand*
1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) agree 5) strongly agree
- *A new classification will supplement technological controls on minors' access to age-inappropriate computer games*
1) strongly disagree, 2) **disagree** 3) do not know 4) agree 5) strongly agree
- *Comparable classification systems internationally have an adult rating for computer games - international parity is desirable*
1) strongly disagree 2) **disagree**, 3) do not know 4) agree 5) strongly agree
- *Consumers access games which would be R 18+ illegally – it would be better if they were legally available with appropriate restrictions*
1) **strongly disagree**, 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) agree 5) strongly agree
- *Computer games should be treated differently from films given the specific, negative effects of interactivity on players, particularly their participation in violent and aggressive content.*
1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) **agree** 5) strongly agree,
- *It would be difficult for parents to enforce age restrictions for computer games.*
1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) agree 5) **strongly agree**,
- *Minors would be more likely to be exposed to computer games that are unsuitable for them.*
1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) **agree** 5) strongly agree,

- *An R 18+ for computer games would exacerbate problems associated with access to high level material in Indigenous communities and by other non-English speaking people*

1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) agree 5) **strongly agree** ,

- *There is no demonstrated need to change existing restrictions.*

1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) do not know 4) agree, 5) strongly agree

Comments (Optional - up to 250 words)

This committee opposes the introduction of the category of an R 18+ classification for computer games, as its above answers indicate. It believes that the interactive, 'virtual world' does indeed impact the psyche of a proportion of players of all ages especially impressionable young, under-aged players, to the point of doing them mental harm.

It would request that the OFLC now further tighten the MA 15+ category, adding titles to the RC category.

Yours Sincerely,

Rev. Stefan Slucki;

Seacliff SA,

Convener.

