



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	375/03
2. Advertiser	Volvo Car Australia Pty Ltd
3. Product	Vehicles
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Language – use of language – section 2.5
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 11 November 2003
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The material complained of relates to a child in the back seat of a Volvo car saying “Bloody Volvo driver” when her mother, who is driving the car, takes her noisy toy away from her.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made included the following:

“... I could not believe my ears when a young child said bloody Volvo drivers...and to her mother.”

“... a little child saying ‘Bloody Volvo Driver’”

“... this is disgusting talk for such a young child”

“... inappropriate and irresponsible to have a CHILD saying ‘Bloody Volvo Driver’ to her mother.”

“A little child should not be exploited in that way” “... now allowing toddlers/young children to swear in advertisements”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“..... the Third Edition of the Macquarie Dictionary acknowledges the word, ‘bloody’, as a colloquialism and recognises the shift from profane to idiomatic associations of contemporary times.”

“Whilst not a swear word, we nonetheless recognise that the word ‘bloody’ may be deemed inappropriate for children by a minority within the community; and have accordingly ensured that commercials will not air prior to the 8.30pm time-slot.”

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 the majority of the community would view the advertisement as being humorous. Further, it noted Volvo’s decision to move the time slot for the advertisement to the post 8.30 pm time slot.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to language.

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