



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 475/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Kraft Foods Ltd (Nabisco - Chicken in a Biskit) |
| 3. Product | Food & Beverages |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Violence Cruelty to animals – section 2.2 Advertising to Children Code - Social value – section 2.4 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 12 December 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement depicts a bus full of school children some of whom open up packets of the advertised product and begin to eat it. They suddenly start burping and 'vomiting' live chickens. The other children in the bus laugh as the chickens run amok around the bus.

THE COMPLAINT

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

It is not necessary or humourous (sic) to convey the tastiness of biscuits by depicting people vomiting....quite stomach churning...

The images together with the retching noises made me feel the same way I do when I see people vomiting...

It is very inappropriate to use chickens in that way

The ad is generally in poor taste, exploits the animals, and causes the children distress.

They are using LIVE chickens which I think is disrespectful to the animal.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

"The advertisement conveys in a deliberate and farcical way school boys burping chickens to emphasise the fullness of the flavour of Chicken in a Biscuit..."

"The ad is comical..."

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 the images and the sounds of the children in the bus burping and vomiting up chickens.

The Board considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.2 of the code relating to

violence (cruelty to animals). The Board noted that the advertisement was clearly unrealistic and rendered through digital imaging. The Board concluded that the advertisement did not depict cruelty to animals.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement might cause alarm and distress to the audience. The Board concluded that while the advertisement was in bad taste, it was more likely to be regarded as humorous than distressing.

The Board also considered the advertisement under the Code for Advertising to Children, having concluded that the advertisement could have been targetting children under fourteen years of age. The Board considered whether the advertisement would have breached Section 2.3, concerned with portrayal of images that are unduly frightening or distressing to children. The Board found that the advertisement would not have been unduly frightening or distressing to children.

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