



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	0315/18
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 Gender
- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Race
- 2.3 - Violence Domestic Violence

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features the comedians known as Superwog and depicts a husband and wife in bed, both played by male actors. The husband is shown playing a game on his phone while his wife asks what hes doing, and comments "You're always playing games. You do nothing around the house. Why do I always have to do everything. The husband tells her to shut up, and the sound of a boiling kettle can be heard. The wife continues by saying 'you idiot, I'm sick of you, you smell, I want a divorce". The husband selects a cartoon character on his phone that has a target symbol around it and a cartoon bolt of lightning disintegrates his wife. He comments that he loves this game.

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 husband and wife in bed. The wife is seen to be nagging the husband and he presses a button on the game he is playing on his phone and she disappears in a puff of smoke.

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 noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement glorifies domestic violence.

The Panel considered that the depiction of the wife being turned into a cloud of smoke was a depiction which could be considered 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 directly related to the game's features, showing the wife being disintegrated in a similar manner to characters in the game.

The Panel considered that the violence featured was unrealistic and cartoon-like and was not overly graphic or gory.



The Panel considered that the violence in the advertisement was a humorous representation of the games features and was not a depiction which would be likely to be seen as realistic, imitable or promoting domestic violence.

The Panel considered that the slapstick nature of the violence and the satirical and unrealistic situation lessened the impact of the violence depicted.

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.

