



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	418/03
2. Advertiser	Contiki Holidays (Aust) Pty Ltd
3. Product	Travel
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 9 December 2003
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The advertisement opens with the camera panning over the faces of a number of aged people, apparently in an old age home, then focuses on a disgruntled looking youngish woman, with the taglines ‘life ends at 36’ and ‘Contiki 18-35 year olds.’

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*“The advertisement discriminated against elderly Australians by depicting them as lifeless and no further value.”*

*“The general thrust was that anyone over 35 was unworthy. It was also set in an aged person’s home and treated the elderly with total derision and utter disrespect. It is simply not good enough to denigrate the elderly.”*

## **THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE**

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

*“The aim of the campaign is to motivate members of the target group to take advantage of our products before they reach an age at which their enjoyment of these particular products would diminish. Whilst obvious exaggeration and a humorous, ‘tongue in cheek’ approach were employed in the advertisements we do not believe that they are offensive nor do we believe that the advertisements, or Contiki’s products generally, are discriminatory.”*

## **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 viewers would view the advertisement with the humour intended by the advertiser.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to discrimination (age)/vilification. Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.