



Ad Standards Community Panel
PO Box 5110, Braddon ACT 2612
P (02) 6173 1500 | F (02) 6262 9833

AdStandards.com.au

Advertising Standards Bureau Limited
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1	Case Number	0314/18
2	Advertiser	Moon Active
3	Product	Entertainment
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Internet - Social
5	Date of Determination	25/07/2018
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Race
- 2.3 - Violence Violence

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features the comedians known as Superwog. The advertisement begins with a worker in a kitchen sitting on a bench and playing a game on his phone. A chef enters the kitchen and tells him to do the dishes. He says 'no dad, get lost'. His father asks what he's doing and he states. 'I'm playing Coinmaster, you do the dishes'. His phone then shows that he is out of spins. He then asks his father for his credit card details so he can get more spins. His father says OK, then takes the phone and throws it to the ground. The son asks why he did that, and states that he was on the unicorn village. The father says 'unicorn, are you nuts' and we see the son on the ground and the father hitting him. Both men are shown as smiling at the end.

THE COMPLAINT

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

All of these ads, while comedic in nature, portray harmful stereotypes and topics such as glorified domestic violence, unhealthy relationships and racism in an advertisement targeted towards a younger and easily influenced demographic, who would be the





main consumers of this app. The channel superwog1 has a video up named “Working in a Restaurant” which has one of the aforementioned clips from above within it, but the videos can’t be found anywhere else on YouTube so the company cannot be held accountable for the content. Although comedic in nature, they could be seen as disturbing and in my opinion are not appropriate for the main demographic of viewers who would be seeing the ads before partaking in the content they are actually looking to enjoy.

Please contact me if you want to follow this case up, I would be happy to attempt to record the ads the next time they are up in order for them to be properly consumed and assessed. They may not be easily viewable on a regular basis due to them only being targeted towards consumers both my age and younger, so if I can be of any assistance please let me know. This is quite serious but masked in such a way where the advertisements are being shown to thousands to millions of people without any way of reporting them properly.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

The advertiser did not provide a response.

THE DETERMINATION

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the Panel) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Panel noted the complainant’s concern that the advertisement is racist and violent.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser did not provide a response.

The Panel noted that this television advertisement features YouTube comedians Supeperwog, and depicts a worker in a kitchen sitting on a bench and playing a game on his phone. The worker’s father in a chef outfit enters the kitchen and they argue about the son playing games on his phone instead of working. He then asks his father for his credit card details so he can get more spins. His father says OK, then takes the phone and throws it to the ground. The son is then shown on the ground as his father hits him. Both men are shown as smiling at the end.



The Panel considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.1 of the Code which requires that 'advertisements shall not portray or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual preference, religion, disability, mental illness or political belief.'

The Panel noted the Practice Note to Section 2.1 of the Code which provides the following definitions:

"Discrimination – unfair or less favourable treatment
Vilification – humiliates, intimidates, incites hatred, contempt or ridicule".

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement is portraying harmful stereotypes and is racist.

The Panel considered the portrayal of the characters in the advertisement. The Panel considered that the advertisement is a satire of Australian stereotypes, and that these stereotypes were humorous and not discriminatory or vilifying of any person or group of people.

The Panel noted that some members of the community may find this portrayal in bad taste, however noted that the issue of taste is not one which falls under any provision of the Code.

In the Panel's view the advertisement does not single out, discriminate against, or vilify any person or section of the community on the basis of race and did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

The Panel considered whether the advertisement breached Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 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 Panel considered that the depiction of the father throwing his son's phone to the ground, and the image of the father hitting his son were both depictions of violence.

The Panel considered whether the violence depicted was justifiable in the context of promoting an app game.

The Panel considered that the violence depicted was not directly related to the game's features, however considered that the slapstick nature of the comedy was consistent with advertising a cartoon style game.

The Panel considered that the advertisement featured a number of elements that



added to the unrealistic nature of the scene such as the father and son appearing the same age, the chef wearing short shorts and the scene at the end which depicted both men smiling.

The Panel considered that the slapstick nature of the violence and the satirical and unrealistic situation lessened the impact of the violence depicted. In combination with the resolution at the end of the advertisement where the men are both seen smiling, the overall impression of this advertisement is one of slapstick humour and satire and not a depiction of inappropriate violence.

In the Panel's view the level of violence portrayed in the advertisement was justifiable in the context of the product being offered and did not breach Section 2.3 of the Code.

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

