



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 79/09                        |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Hungry Jacks                 |
| 3. Product                    | Fast Food                    |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV                           |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Violence Other – section 2.2 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Wednesday, 11 March 2009     |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed                    |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This television advertisement from Hungry Jacks for its 'Angry Whopper' burger is set at an anger management session. A thin young man dressed in a short sleeved business shirt and trousers is describing his feelings of frustration when in a traffic jam. Other people in the session are dressed in casual clothes, jumpers, jeans and checked shirts, one is in business attire, others are in leather jackets and some have tattoos. Other people at the session look at each other when the young man tells the group he gets so angry that he beeps his horn. The advertisement ends with an image of the burger and a voiceover says: "That's not angry, this is angry" and then provides details of the burger ingredients.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*Ad clearly reinforces undesirable stereotypes of what it means to be a "real man". Since it was screening in a programme and at a time when many children and impressionable adolescents would certainly be watching, I believe it contravenes whatever the "social values" line of the code means.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*As a responsible corporate citizen, with a long history in Australia, Hungry Jack's takes its responsibilities very seriously, particularly when it comes to advertising and the portrayal of social values. It has always been our intention to comply with all the relevant guidelines in regard to advertising and we believe the commercial in question has not breached any of the guidelines.*

*1. The advertisement for the Angry Whopper promotion ran nationally on TV from the 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2008 to the 5<sup>th</sup> of January 2009. This promotion has run its course and the product is no longer available.*

*In response to the complaint the ad is a satire showing that there are a number of ways and levels of Anger but there is only 1 Angry Whopper. The use of the range of characters at the Anger Management Class shows that anyone can be angry in their own terms but only Hungry Jacks has the spicy hot "Angry Whopper" We respectfully request that this complaint against our advertisement be dismissed on the on the above grounds.*

## **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 the complainant's concern that the advertisement vilified men.

The Board noted that the only people at the anger management session were men. Some members of the Board considered that the advertisement stereotyped men as being participants at an anger management class. However the majority noted that the advertisement was clearly not meant to be serious or vilifying of men. The Board considered that the advertisement did not make any suggestion about what constitutes a 'real man' or that violence or anger is desirable. The Board considered that the advertisement did not vilify or discriminate against men and did not breach section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board considered that the advertisement does not depict violence or suggest that violence or anger is acceptable or desirable. The Board determined that the advertisement did not include violence and that there is no breach of section 2.2 of the Code.

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