



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 27/05 |
| 2. Advertiser | McDonalds Aust Ltd (Ronald McDonald House) |
| 3. Product | Restaurants |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 8 March 2005 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement is a series of advertisements which features female parents being interviewed about their experience with Ronald McDonald House.

THE COMPLAINT

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

"I have noticed your advertisement on television re Ronald McDonald House and posters wherein the father-child relationship is devalued by your biased portrayal of mothers and women as carers predominantly."

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

"The mini documentaries are displaying either a sole parent in a care capacity or one member of the family that is staying at the House as home is a significant distance away. These, I'm instructed, are real stories."

"It is not an unusual situation for the mother to take this role staying at RMHC."

"However, in all the advertising material produced by McDonald's for RMHC we take into consideration the importance of all care-givers and do not attempt to discriminate on any grounds be they sex, marriage, religion, disability or any other ground which is the subject of specific legislation."

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 that footage of male care givers attending the House was present in the advertisement. In any event, the Board was of the view that in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not find this advertisement offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of people (sex).

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