



## CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	11/06
2. Advertiser	Australian Fast Foods (Red Rooster)
3. Product	Food & Beverages
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Language – use of language – section 2.5
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 February 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement promotes Red Rooster's "icious" deal of Classic Quarter, chips and 390ml coke for \$6.50. The male voiceover is heard with a north England accent saying "...the chicken is delicious .... the chips are delicious ..... the coke is delicious. In fact, at \$6.50 the whole deal is 'icious'.

## THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*It is obvious to everybody I speak to that the 'F' word is used blatantly in this commercial.*

*It is spoken by a person using a 'Scottish accent' and the words are in 'fact' the whole things delicious'.*

*Offensive language in ones home during commercials where it is unexpected and not pre-warned is unacceptable to people ...*

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

*The phrase in question is "...in **fact**, the whole deal is, ....icious!" (advertiser's emphasis).*

*I can understand the potential confusion, as the voiceover is done in a Geordie accent, which hails from the north-east of England, particularly the City of Newcastle.*

*Should Red Rooster decide to ever run the material again, we will undertake to re-record the voice-over so as to avoid any further potential misunderstandings.*

## THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board considered the advertisement and did not consider that the language used in the advertisement, which was clearly the word 'fact' was inappropriate nor was it strong or obscene.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.