



Case Report

1	Case Number	0415/10
2	Advertiser	MasterCard Worldwide
3	Product	Finance/Investment
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	13/10/2010
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.2 - Violence Hooliganism-vandalism-graffiti

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A man is shown buying various items (toothbrush, food, wine) and he never stops moving, even when he is paying with his Mastercard. In one scene he rolls over the bonnet of a stationary car.

We then see him at home running around and tidying up, just before his date knocks at the door.

The ad ends with the super: having time on your side: priceless

THE COMPLAINT

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

The Mastercard TV advert where the guy rolls over the bonnet of a car is unacceptable. If he did this to my car he would be arrested for damaging private property. This ad is setting a poor example for young impressionable guys and girls.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Regarding the concerns raised:

- *Guy rolling over the bonnet of a car causing damage to private property and*
- *Setting a poor example for impressionable guys and girls*

Firstly, the ad was not intended to upset any member of the public. The inclusion of our guy rolling over the bonnet of the car was to dramatise a moment in our hero's 'un-real' world and show that you really can keep moving when using PayPass, as nothing gets in your way. Through consumer research, we know that our intended audience aspires for this 'non-stop' world, given the hectic life they lead. Moreover, at no point during this extensive research did anyone indicate the possibility of this consumer outtake.

Further to this, it is important for MasterCard that our talent is a positive representative and ambassador of our brand. We are very confident that our hero's aspirational qualities are reflected in his clothing, and the apartment we see at the end of the ad.

It was never our intention to present our hero guy in a way that could associate him or our brand with any kind of crime or vandalism, nor do we feel our ad encourages this behaviour. It is our clear belief that the audience this commercial is aimed at would recognise the 'un-real world' our guy lives in.

We support the notion of depicting responsible advertising in general and we hope the above outlines a clear understanding of our intentions.

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 is setting a poor example for young impressionable males and females in that it depicts an act of vandalism.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with section 2.2 of the Code which requires that advertisements 'shall not present violence unless it is justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised.'

The Board noted that the advertisement features a scene where a young man rolls over the bonnet of a car. The Board noted the advertiser's response that this scene was used to dramatise a moment in an 'un-real' world and reflect that people really can keep moving when using PayPass, as nothing gets in the way. The Board noted that the style and visuals of the advertisement indicated a fantasy scenario and that most members of the community would recognise that the advertisement featured un-real situations.

The Board noted that the car which the man rolls over is stationary and that the intent of his action is not to cause damage but to get from one side of the road to the other without stopping. The Board considered that the advertisement is not promoting an act of vandalism, or suggesting that this action be replicated by members of the community, and determined that the advertisement is not setting a poor example.

On this basis the Board determined that the advertisement did not depict or condone violence in the form of vandalism, and was not in breach of section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.6 of the Code. Section 2.6 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety”.

The Board noted that the car in the advertisement was stationary and that the man took no unnecessary risks by rolling over the bonnet. The Board considered that the advertisement depicts fantasy scenarios and that the action of rolling over the bonnet of the car fitted in with the theme of the advertisement. The Board determined that the advertisement was not suggesting that members of the community copy this action as a means of getting from one side of the road to the other.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not depict “material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety”

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