



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 335/03 |
| 2. Advertiser | Nissan Motor Aust. Pty Ltd (Pulsar) |
| 3. Product | Vehicles |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Language – use of language – section 2.5 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 14 October 2003 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement cuts through a series of scenes showing various employees of departments of the Nissan company carrying out their respective roles in respect of the creation and development of the Nissan Pulsar vehicle. In between those scenes the camera angle cuts to shots of the car driving along a road. A voiceover is heard as follows:

“The new Nissan Pulsar. The design department spent thousands of man hours refining the body. The interior designers didn’t rest. And the pricing department, well they haven’t done a bloody thing”.

The final scene is of a man sitting in his office (presumably an employee of the pricing department) eating food and reading a golfing magazine. The voiceover then continues:

“The new Nissan Pulsar. Still from only \$19,990”.

A visual scene of the car and price details is shown and the scene cuts to a black background with the words “Team Nissan Dealers” appearing.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“There are plenty of other decent words they could use to their better advantage...think of the kiddies”

“Now you might say ‘bloody’ is a pretty innocuous word, everyone uses it. They don’t. Some people, believe it or not, find it offensive and certainly do not want their children using it”.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“Nissan Australia gave serious consideration to the time slots within which the advertisements would be aired. This was to ensure that, amongst other things, the advertisements would be aired at appropriate times and would not, for example, be aired during programs specifically aimed at children”.

“... We believe that far from being offensive, the use of the word bloody is now broadly accepted by the general public as a means of conveying an emotional emphasis”.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board, having regard to the timeslot during which the advertisement was aired, considered the intended humour of the advertisement and decided that, in context, the language used was not offensive. The Board found that the content did not contravene any provision of the Code.

Accordingly the complaint was dismissed.