



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 151/03 |
| 2. Advertiser | Kelloggs (Aust) Pty Ltd (Coco Pops) |
| 3. Product | Food |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Race – section 2.1
Language – use of language – section 2.5 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 10 June 2003 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This cartoon-style television advertisement is one of a series featuring a Coco- the-Monkey character battling adversaries for his Coco Pops. After various other encounters, Coco is shown to project a rat-type character through the window of an area labeled ‘Sumo Showers,’ where it ends up sandwiched between the buttocks of a sumo wrestler. Coco says: “Now that really cracks me up,” before starting to eat a bowl of Coco Pops.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“This is distasteful advertising because it shows the sumo wrestler (as a representation of Japanese culture) in a degrading position, plus the joke is derogatory.”

“The word ‘crack’ I believe has an intentional double meaning when used. In context it may mean that the event that occurred is funny. However, it can also be perceived as the vernacular or slang ‘crack’ referring to part of the backside...I cannot see any reason for the use of this word/phrase in the ad except to add humour in an offensive manner.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

Noting the advertiser’s advice that its consumer services department had not received any complaints about this advertisement, the Board considered that, within the context of prevailing community standards, the material would not be considered offensive by the majority of people exposed to it.

The Board dismissed the complaint on determination that the advertisement did not constitute discrimination and/or vilification as represented in the Code, and that it did not otherwise breach the Code in relation to the use of language or on any other grounds.