



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 40/07 |
| 2. Advertiser | Adelaide City Council (Rundle Mall) |
| 3. Product | Retail |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Nationality – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 13 February 2007 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

There are three advertisements in this series, which feature a Russian male complaining that his wife Sveta is always out shopping at Rundle Mall's 800 shops. He relates:

1. "Back in homeland, we have no choice. Everyone has the same car, same borsch soup, same furry hat. Now we have Rundle Mall. 800 shop. So many choice".
2. "Yesterday, Sveta go to the dentist. Ten hour later, she come home. With filling all right. This bag filled. This bag filled. This one, well half filled. I say what about dentist. She say she went in Rundle Mall. But tell me - if Rundle Mall have 800 shop. Where they fit dentist?"
3. "My Sveta now eat meal at Rundle Mall. She say more choice of food. I say what you mean (more choice)? Here at home we have baked potato, boiled potato, potato soup, potato salad. That is choice. You cannot tell me Rundle Mall beat that".

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

This commercial depicts Russians as people who have no choice. I am sick of being told by many native Australians that Russia is a poor country where people have no choice. This particular commercial reinforces the belief that it is actually so. This commercial, in my view, demonstrates disrespect to Russian national pride in general. I can personally tell you that in this day and age in Russia you may have much wider choice than in Australia.

Australia is a multinational country and I believe everyone should treat different nationalities with the same respect and dignity.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Adelaide City Council launched the Rundle Mall Marketing Campaign on 14 August 2005. The campaign has been on air since this date, with the rotation of the three television commercials forming over 90% of all television advertising for Rundle Mall. As can be seen by the media schedules enclosed, the commercials have been heavily programmed over the last one and a half year's with no other known complaints made to the Advertising Standards Bureau.

Adelaide City Council strongly acknowledges its responsibility to the community at large and prior to the broadcasting of this campaign for Rundle Mall, undertook extensive research to test

public perception and attitudes toward cultural sensitivity of the content contained within the Rundle Mall television commercial. Virtually all key stakeholders and ethnic community representatives consulted felt the advertisements did not cause offence to them personally, and they also felt they were unlikely to cause offence to any ethnic groups.

The creative was chosen for its ability to appeal to a broad mass audience, no matter what gender, age, culture or lifestyle choice. The campaign focuses on selling the message through humour and maximising opportunity for cut through, recall of the advertisement and brand.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The board viewed the advertisement and considered whether it breached Section 2.1 of the Code dealing with discrimination against nationality.

The Board noted the complainant's comments that he was offended. The Board noted the dialogue of the advertisement and the comical nature of the Russian character. The Board agreed that the advertisement employed a comical stereotype, but did not agree that the advertisement actually discriminated against or vilified people of Russian extraction.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.