



Case Report

1	Case Number	0158/11
2	Advertiser	Coca-Cola South Pacific Pty Ltd
3	Product	Food and Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	25/05/2011
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.2 - Violence Hooliganism-vandalism-graffiti

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The Coke Zero Team Left Field Coach and AFL player Harry 'big kicker' O'Brien are in training to take on Port Power. The 'left field' training technique is to 'kick out' the lights in the stadium, appearing to kick a football into each set of stadiums lights, knocking them out.

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

I believe if any kids were watching this seeing a footballer doing this that it would give them the idea of going and trying it themselves and that it is ok to go do it.

With the amount of vandalism already in the community this would only add to the already growing problem.

I hope you can get this add taken off TV as I believe it is sending the wrong message.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

We understand from the complaints that the complainants believe the advertisement contravenes section 2 of the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics, specifically section 2.2 relating to violence.

The commercial is one of a series about the mythical creation of the Coke Zero 'Team Left Field.' Coke Zero 'Team Left Field' is a footy team which undertakes unconventional training methods designed to showcase and stretch their skills. In this execution, Harry O'Brien, who is known for his big powerful kicking, kicks a football into the stadium's lights. This is obviously not an achievable feat even for a skilled footballer and the trick in the TVC has been made possible using special effects and is entirely fictitious.

The make believe 'skill' is not violent and in fact no vandalism actually takes place. Further, given the location (in a football stadium) and the distance of the kicks (over 90 m to the stadium lights), it is not expected that people would either try to replicate or in fact be successful in replicating this stunt.

Our intention, as with all of our advertising, is to engage and amuse our target audience. This ad therefore features a well-known football team performing extraordinary 'skills' which appeals to our target audience for Coke Zero.

We thank you for contacting us regarding this advertisement however in this instance we disagree that we have contravened Section 2 of the code.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ("Board") considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the "Code").

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement features and encourages vandalism.

The Board reviewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not present or portray violence unless it is justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised."

The Board considered that the depiction of the AFL player kicking a ball 90 metres to knock out a stadium light was clearly achieved through the use of special effects as this would not be possible. The Board considered that the advertisement was aimed at teenage boys and that it is not likely anyone could replicate the kick in real life.

The Board noted that trying to knock out stadium lights is not something to be encouraged, however the Board considered that the advertisement was not encouraging acts of vandalism but showing an over the top trick which would appeal to the target audience.

Because of the exaggerated nature of the image shown the Board considered that this behavior was not a realistic depiction of vandalism and was unlikely to lead to copycat/antisocial behaviour.

On this basis the Board determined that the advertisement did not breach of Section 2.2 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.