

From: [Sean Murphy](#)
To: [Digital Monitoring](#)
Subject: ACCC into social media feedback as a consumer.
Date: Tuesday, 23 August 2022 9:13:41 PM

Hello ACCC

I have a few points that I want to share. Some of these points are not necessarily covered in your post but should be covered. If the goal is to ensure consumers and business can access social media. What I am going to explain here is critical for the Australian and International landscape.

1. Accessibility – the level of accessibility within these platforms is sub-standard. Yes, a lot of disable users use the platforms. But they get frustrated frequently with the content they cannot access. Customised interfaces for the screen reader user community instead of creating a single environment for everyone. If they include accessibility at all. Each platform has different levels from reasonable to poor. For example: when YouTube plays add. They frequently place the skip add option in different places. Thus if you are a screen reader user you have to hunt for the information. Making it very hard to hear the skip add option while the add is playing and to find it. Facebook has this endless scrolling of content which makes it very hard to use on the mobile app to find other content. Using the standard web Facebook interface is a chore for someone using a screen reader. There is a lot of the content on these platforms which are not accessible or has no features to prompt content creators to include accessibility capabilities. This also applies to Youtube and other similar platforms. I spend more time trying to find information on the page than using the site. From my point of view, equality to social media does not exist for the disability community. There is a lot of content we cannot access or even aware of.
2. I stopped using Facebook because I don't own my data. If I post a photo, apparently Facebook own the content. This is my understanding for other platforms as well.
3. Privacy of my data is a major concern. What the EU has done is something we should adopt in this country. These companies treat us customers as a product to sell to other companies without my permission or giving me any commercial benefit.
4. Their AI technology supports peoples way of thinking. Thus if you only look up a single topic, the AI will send you the same type of content. Hence narrowing someone's way of thinking. This is not a healthy model for society. Using the old fashion newspapers, you would find articles of interest that you were not looking forward.
5. I don't trust social media as either the data can be used by a foreign country, the company dictates how it will be used, they don't take ownership of the radical and false information on their platforms. As far as I am concern, they have provided the platform to the world, thus they take ownership. If someone gets spammed, then the company should be held countable for it. They need to introduce the required processes to validate the information is correct.
6. The business model needs to change for these platforms. I heard a radio show on the ABC RN Drawing room which provided a different model than the current approach in Early July The author gave different models would benefit sociasociety in a better fashion.
7. The total like and watch option should be removed from everyone's views. AS this is how some people will rank content. So if a person gets a high enough watch ranking, then people will wrongly assume they have something good to say. The author of the content should see the like and watch numbers. Not the audience. By doing this, people hopefully will have a more objective view and will not be persuaded by the numbers.

8. So call Influences is a major problem. When the person pushes health, beauty, science views, political views, etc. It is their opinion and not based upon fact. If they state the specific story is based upon fact, a lot of them don't provide the evidence to back it up from reliable resources. For example, I saw someone promoting a magic pill that will make you lose weight, give you more energy, improve your attention, etc. No facts, no links to a wide range of scientific papers for people to go and validate if they want. People don't use critical thinking when they read or watch content that is not backed up with facts. On the flip side, there is Influences who provide good educational content based upon their knowledge. Watching the content they are clearly showing their point of view, not stating it is fact.

Influences who promote products must be held accountable if the product does not live up to what they are saying. Such as if someone is pushing some beauty product and this product has side effects which they don't reveal. Then they should be legally liable. This should apply to any product, service or good being promoted or sold. Regardless of the genre. As these people are being paid by the social media platform or the business. In fact all three should be held accountable legally.

News articles need to be held accountable even if it is opinion views. Similar standards used within the Media from the 80's. Today, you cannot trust any media content even from the major news outlets as they are just a bunch of social media posts in a lot of the cases. Good journalism is rare to find today.

9. Advertisement, I will use Youtube for example. The other platforms I don't use enough to make a comment but I would be surprised if they are not just as bad. When I watch content on youtube. Every 5 minutes or so I am forced to watch an advert. So watching a 30 min video, takes twice as long as I am not a subscriber. The cost is nearly \$20 AUD per month which is a lot of money for this service. As the interface is not that accessible or useable by a screen reader user. The amount of content I would watch is very small compared to their catalogue. I am not complaining there are adverts. I am complaining the frequency of when they appear. They are far more frequent than free to Air TV. 2 to 3 times in a 30 minute period for a single advert is enough. The adverts themselves are not necessarily very accessible either and I cannot access the info.

10. Content creators on these platforms are not inclusive and do discriminate on a frequent basis. For example, I was on one of the social media platforms. A person was demonstrating a specific topic I was interested in. I ask them if I could get an accessible version and was told no. If this is a part of your focus or not, not sure. But is a major problem. As I cannot take these people via the DDA due to them being based in another country. Some of the games or other apps available via Facebook or other platforms again are not accessible blocking disabled people out of this content.

In summary:

- Business must be held accountable for the content they put up to ensure everyone can access and the same laws for advertisement to sell services and goods should apply. Accessibility of their content regardless what it is must be equally accessible to everyone.
- Influences the same applies as above.
- The social media platform also should be held accountable equally if a breach of any law in this country is breached. Thus if I have an Influences who will not provide myself equal access to the content. Then the platform should be held accountable as they are based in this country and freely make the content accessible to everyone. I know they will fight this point tooth and nail.

Sean