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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this article is to bring together established research in the field of consumer complaint responses: to contextualise this research into the area of complaints about advertising in Australia; and to empirically test the proposition that it is possible to construct a profile of complainants about advertising in Australia.

Design/methodology/approach – Postcodes obtained from the Advertising Standards Board complaints database were entered into Pacific Micromarketing's MOSAIC software, which uses data at the postcode level to cluster individuals into homogeneous groups.

Findings – Characteristics shared among consumers who engage in “amplified voicing” include above average income levels, above average disposable income levels, higher than average education levels, professional and associate professional occupations, middle- to late-middle-aged household heads and above average representation of working women. Their interests tend towards culture, technology, entertaining, sport, food and fashion.

Research limitations/implications – Complainants seem to be unrepresentative of those most likely to be disadvantaged by “unacceptable” advertising. It is suggested that it now falls to advertising professionals and marketing academics to encourage greater involvement of all members of Australian society in the current complaints process and build wider understanding of practices that contravene the regulatory system.

Originality/value – This study investigates the effects of advertising on consumers and hence on society in general, and examines the changing nature and structure of the advertising self-regulatory system in Australia. Though based on fieldwork in Australia, it provides an international perspective, and is potentially transferable to other societies.

Introduction

Heeding a call from Mazis (1997), this study investigates marketing and public policy from two perspectives: first, the marketing technique of advertising, which has noted effects on society; second, regulatory policy in the changing nature and structure of the advertising self-regulatory system in Australia, which has definite marketing dimensions. Further, its non-American international focus follows Mazis's initiative.
National expenditure on advertising

Advertising has been described as “pervasive, intrusive and pernicious” while advertisers have been labelled as “mischievous” in their attempts to reach and persuade their target markets (Harker and Wiggs, 1999). However, advertising can be argued to be vital from both economic and social perspectives (Abernethy and Franke, 1996, 1998). Globally, advertising spending has grown dramatically with advertising expenditures in the USA, UK and Australia, for example, amounting to over 1 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (CEASA, 2002). Further, the five countries with the highest annual advertising expenditure (the USA, Japan, Germany, the UK and France) have seen it almost double in the last ten years (CEASA, 2002). Australia, likewise, has experienced an almost twofold rise over the last ten years, to SUS6 billion (CEASA, 2000, 2002). Australia ranks second in the world behind the U.S., in terms of advertising expenditure as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (Figure 1), and also has one of the four largest international per-capita ratios (Figure 2).

According to the Commercial Economic Advisory Service of Australia, more than half of this large national advertising budget was allocated in 2001 to the various print media. Television took the second-highest share, at just less than a quarter, and the remaining mainstream media – radio, outdoor and cinema – collectively accounted for just over 12 per cent (CEASA, 2002).

Regulation of advertising output

These basic facts of the Australian advertising industry confirm the economic and social imperative for investigating the system for exercising control over the consequences. Research has revealed a connection between annual advertising expenditure in a nation and the presence of a self-regulatory body concerned with the investigation of “unacceptable” advertising (Miracle and Nevitt, 1987). It has been suggested that the more money spent on advertising in a country, the greater the need for protection from unacceptable advertising (Harker, 2000a,b). Extant research highlights the emphasis placed on this of this most visible element of the marketing mix, and its social and economic importance. It also identifies concerns regarding the potentially adverse effect that advertising can have on the more vulnerable members of society, such as minority groups vilified in advertisements (examples are given in Table I), and regarding the responses available to those elements of society who are “disadvantaged” by advertising.

Volkov et al. (2002a, b) defined this type of socially irresponsible advertising as “unacceptable”, as are advertisements that are unfair, misleading, deceptive, offensive, or false. Cases in point are described in Table I. It is for these reasons that it has become important to address the issue of the responses to consumer complaints by the industry and its regulators. In our research, we determined the antecedent factors influencing complaints to the Advertising Standards Board and built a demographic profile of complainants. Our study was able to bring together disparate theoretical research that appears in published literature and empirically test these theories in one major study, enabling a holistic profile of the complaining public to be modelled.

In Australia, the increasingly necessary mechanism for consumers to voice their complaints about “unacceptable advertising” comprises a legal-regulatory framework and an industry-funded, self-regulatory framework. This system ensures that consumers have an opportunity express their disapproval of specific advertisements, for whatever reason.
The Australian self-regulatory system

Complaints about advertising in Australia mainly relate to television commercials and outdoor advertising (Advertising Standards Bureau, 2002).

Figure 3 depicts schematically the structure in which the Advertising Standards Bureau (ASB, 2003), comprising the Advertising Standards Board and the Advertising Claims Board, discharges its responsibility for regulating advertising in Australia.

The current system was set up in 1998, after the 1996 decision of the Media Council of Australia to disband a previous complaint-handling body, and its system of advertising codes and regulation. As a result of research conducted with the assistance of industry, government and consumer representatives, the Australian Association of National Advertisers (AANA) followed the principles outlined by the Australian parliament to fulfil their commitment to develop a more effective system of self-regulation for the national advertising industry (ASB, 1999).

The ASB is dedicated to upholding advertising standards through independent complaint resolution processes. Public complaints in relation to issues including health and safety, the use of language, the discriminatory portrayal of people, concern for children and portrayals of violence, sex, sexuality and nudity are considered on a cost-free basis by the Advertising Standards Board. Competitive claims in relation to truth, accuracy and legality of advertising are considered on a user-pay, cost-recovery basis by the Advertising Claims Board. The Australian Advertising Industry Council, which administers and enforces the codes of practice on which the Advertising Standards Board makes judgements, has tried to limit the number of special codes it has formulated. These include (but are not limited to) those for therapeutic goods advertising, slimming products advertising, cigarette advertising and alcoholic beverages advertising (www.advertisingstandardsbureau.com.au). This self-regulatory system is entirely funded through a voluntary levy administered by the Advertising Standards Council, set at 0.035 per cent of media billings of the members of the AANA (ASB, 1998a).

To lodge a complaint, it is necessary to write formally to the Advertising Standards Board, giving a description of the advertisement, stating where and when it was seen, and providing the name and address of the complainant. The specific reason for concern about the advertisement must be made clear. Anonymous complaints or those made by telephone are not considered (www.advertisingstandardsbureau.com.au). The Advertising Standards Board determines whether or not an advertisement that has been the subject of a complaint is:

- in breach of the AANA Code, in which case the complaint is upheld;
- not in breach of the Code, in which case the complaint is dismissed; and
- beyond the scope of Section 2 of the AANA Code, in which case the verdict is that the complaint falls outside the Advertising Standards Board charter.

This process is depicted schematically in Figure 4.

Between 1998 and 2002, 404 of the 9,358 complaints received by the Advertising Standards Board were upheld in whole or in part – a “success rate” from the complainants' point of view of only 4.3 per cent (www.advertisingstandardsbureau.com.au). These figures are comparable to those presented in the research conducted by Crosier and Erdogan (2001) who investigated
complaints about television commercials made to the equivalent regulatory body in the UK. Once a complaint has been upheld, discontinuation of the advertisement in question is virtually certain. According to the ASB (1999), there is 100 per cent industry compliance with Board determination, advertisers either modifying or withdrawing the advertisement in response to the ruling (ASB, 1999).

Consumers’ responses to unacceptable advertising

This study is concerned with complainants’ responses rather than, as is more usual, complaining behaviour, on the basis that “no action” should be treated as a non-behavioural response. Therefore, we define consumer complaint responses as the set of multiple, active behavioural responses, which involve the communication of negative perceptions relating to a consumption episode and are triggered by dissatisfaction and anger arising from it (Bougie et al., 2003; Day, 1984; Rogers and Williams, 1990; Singh and Howell, 1985). It can be argued that this implies that consumer complaint responses are influenced by a multitude of situational, product and personal variables and unrelated to, but triggered by, the intensity of the consumer's dissatisfaction. This assertion is supported by empirical evidence discussed by Nicosia and Mayer (1976), Day (1984), Tse et al. (1989), Vezina and Nicosia (1990) and Bougie et al. (2003).

Responses

A review of the literature relating to consumer behaviour in this field of study, by Rogers and Williams (1990), has indicated that researchers are united in their understanding of post-purchase consumer dissatisfaction, asserting that there are three possible course of action in response (Andreasen and Manning, 1990; Hirschman, 1970; Singh, 1988, 1990). These are:

1. exiting;
2. direct voicing; and
3. amplified voicing.

Exiting describes a personal boycott against the seller or manufacturer to avoid a repetition of the original transaction that led to the dissatisfaction. Exiting behaviour, when working well, obviates the need for public policy intervention. Voicing occurs when exiting is unlikely (for example, if the seller is a monopolistic public utility) or when exiting would not yield appropriately perceived restitution in the opinion of the individual consumer. Direct voicing represents the consumer complaining directly to the seller. Amplified voicing occurs when the consumer enlists the support of third parties such as newspaper journalists, consumer protection agencies or industry regulatory or self-regulatory bodies to act on her or his behalf. Thus, Australian consumers exposed to advertising that they consider to have placed them in a position of inequity may respond through amplified voicing. This paper focuses on the particular expression of that response that involves soliciting the support of the Advertising Standards Board on their behalf.

Dissatisfaction

There is no single accepted academic theory of dissatisfaction within consumer complaining behaviour (Boote, 1998; Erevelles and Leavitt, 1992; Woodruff et al., 1991; Yi, 1990). In this study, we have chosen to apply equity theory to consumer dissatisfaction within the setting of responses to advertising. This decision was based on the extensive review of literature and
subsequent investigation of satisfaction by Fournier and Mick (1999). Their work suggests that the equity model of satisfaction is most appropriate here because the consumers interact with the marketing agent to enable the comparison of input-output ratios between the consumer and the agent. This is further supported by research involving service recovery undertaken by Andreassen (2000), Hoffman and Kelley (2000) and Mattila (2001). Equity theory relates to perceived fairness of a particular transaction (Boote, 1998). Tse (1990) defines three possible outcomes:

1. equity;
2. positive inequity; and
3. negative inequity.

Equity is said to occur when the relative inputs and outputs from both parties to a transaction are perceived to be equal. Inequity then can be seen to have occurred when the inputs and outputs from both parties to a transaction are perceived to be unequal. Positive inequity is said to exist when a consumer perceives a greater gain from the transaction than the other party, in terms of either inputs or outputs. Negative inequity occurs when the other party to the transaction is perceived to have gained more than the consumer. According to equity theory, consumer dissatisfaction results from negative inequity. Equity judgements can be seen to be based on the consumer's perceptions of fairness (Fisher et al., 1999; Oliver and Swan, 1989). Resnik and Harmon (1983) argue that the inherent personal biases mean that consumers and advertisers rarely agree on the appropriateness or fairness of responses to consumer complaints.

Past studies have examined demographic and psychographic characteristics of complainants that may trigger a complaint. Table II shows that propensity to complain is affected by such attributes as age, gender, income, level of education, place of residence, lifecycle stage, personal values, personality factors, attitudes towards complaining, attitudes regarding business and government, personal confidence levels and attitude to past complaining situations.

The research issue: complaining about advertising in Australia

Several authors have published studies identifying the aspects of advertisements that may offend consumers (Barnes and Dotson, 1990; Boddewyn, 1989; Ford et al., 1997; Prendergast and Huang, 2003; Prendergast et al., 2002; Waller, 1999). Table I summarises the particular forms of unacceptability on which upheld complaints have been based in recent years in Australia.

The literature suggests that there are broad differences between those consumers who complain and those who do not. Therefore, an avenue for relevant research would be to progress from purely demographic analyses to construct a more complete profile of people who complain about advertising in Australia. The research question that this study addresses is thus the one encapsulated in the title of this paper: “Who's complaining?”

Methodology

The three formal research objectives were:

1. to bring together established research in the field of consumer complaint responses;
2. to contextualise it into complaining about advertising in Australia; and
3. to empirically test the proposition that it is feasible to construct a profile of complainants.

The research results should thereby offer superior marketing intelligence to both academics and advertising strategists, in the form of a better understanding of the complaining public, and identify more effective ways for practitioners to reach their target markets without engaging in destructive discourse through publicised complaints about their output.

Postcodes obtained from the Advertising Standards Board complaints database were entered into Pacific Micromarketing's MOSAIC software, which is a geodemographic classification tool that “uses data at the postcode level to cluster individuals into homogenous groups” (Crosier et al., 1999, p. 843). MOSAIC uses 149 variables (including age, income, occupation, household composition, life stage, type of residence, and the like) to describe Australian neighbourhoods by allocating them into 41 types, within nine groups, at a level of 20 households. These different types have been assigned values based on cluster analyses conducted. Each postcode in Australia is assigned to one of these types based on data compiled by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Australian Census, the Australian Taxation Office, the Australian Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training and the Prospect Universe (another Pacific Micromarketing service product). Sleight (1995) and Crosier and Erdogan (2001) discuss the acceptability of using this commercial classification system as a research tool, which recognises that people define themselves by the “homogeneous neighbourhoods in which they choose to live” (Crosier and Erdogan, 2001, p. 115).

Findings

Our study analysed the postcodes of 1,210 individual complainants to the Advertising Standards Board. Since none had failed to provide a postcode, this was a true census. The ASB started recording complainants’ details in an electronic database only recently, which accounts for the difference between number of postcodes available and number of complaints since the Board's inception. The postcodes were assigned MOSAIC codes and analysed by the software package.

Profile of complainants

Figure 5 displays the MOSAIC profile of the 1,210 complainants and compares it with that of the general population of Australia, indicating under- and over-representation in the complainant sample. Table III displays the significance of the MOSAIC profile for each cluster identified. An index over 120 indicates increased propensity to complain, under 80 indicates a decrease in the tendency to complain, and a value between 80 and 120 is taken as an average propensity.

This profile indicates an over-representation of three MOSAIC groups: White Collar Affluents, Independent Young Achievers and Suburban Singles and Sharers. Within these, MOSAIC disaggregates the over-represented types as follows.

White-collar affluents. Champagne and Chardonnays are wealthy business-oriented families where the parents are usually in middle to late middle age. Their interests include culture, entertaining, technology and sport. Asset-rich commuters have income that is well above
average, and are well educated with qualifications in business, engineering, education and health. Their interests include culture, international food and sport. Educated influentials tend to be older individuals with a disposable income well above average and high levels of education, with representation in prestige occupations such as managers, business owners, lecturers, doctors and lawyers. Suburban success stories also have household disposable incomes well above the national average, tend to be academically well educated and are successful in business and trade. The parents of these families are generally middle aged.

Independent young achievers. Affluent apartments are home to those with high income levels, who are highly qualified in fields such as business, health and the law and have significantly high disposable income. The café society sub-group contains twice the national average proportion of professionals in areas such as property, business services, finance and insurance, who have very high disposable income and tend to be technically literate.

Suburban singles and sharers. Cosmopolitan and cultural describes a sophisticated sub-group with a strong international and cultural dimension to their lifestyles. Employment is mainly in government and the professions occupations. Individual incomes and disposable income levels are well above average. Urban renewals are generally well educated, with a high proportion in professional occupations, high salaries and a passion for fashion, fine food and cultural activities. Country comforts families have a low disposable income, but the cause is that they are in the early stages of mortgage repayment schemes. They enjoy fashion and sport.

The characteristics shared among these MOSAIC segments include above average income levels, above average disposable income levels, higher than average education levels, professional and associate professional occupations, middle to late middle-aged household heads and an above average representation of women in the workforce. Further, the interests of these consumers tend towards culture, technology, entertaining, sport, food and fashion.

Under-represented sub-groups include Miners and Military, Country Town Challenge, Processors and Packers, Roadside Properties, and Red Earth. These are identified by characteristics including relative youth, lower education levels, fewer working women, higher unemployment and a higher proportion of indigenous Australians.

Location of complainants

There is a definite geographical bias in the propensity to complain about advertising in Australia, as indicated in Figure 6 by the disposition of the dark, shaded areas indicating the geographic location of complainants. Visually, it is obvious that the main locus is the major cities on the eastern seaboard of mainland Australia. Though this could obviously be explained by the fact that the majority of the Australian population reside along the eastern seaboard, it might also reflect the heavier promotion of the Advertising Standards Board in those major cities, publication of contact details in telephone directories and the like. This is a contributory factor requiring further investigation.

Conclusion

This study had three aims – to provide a review of the literature pertaining to consumer complaint responses, to contextualise this field of research in the area of advertising in Australia, and to test the feasibility of constructing a fuller profile of complainants than has
been presented previously. The analysis of data collected from actual complainants indicates that there is an apparent polarisation across several geodemographic characteristics within consumer complaining responses. Complainants are much more likely to have a higher income and higher level of education, to work in a professional occupation, to be older and to be female professionals. Non-complainants are more likely to be younger, with a greater chance of being unemployed or otherwise having a lower income level. The implication is that those more disadvantaged consumers may lack a voice in this complaint process. These findings correlate with those presented by Kim et al. (2003) which indicate that consumer alienation and prior life experience affect the likelihood of complaining – as evidenced in this research, in a negative manner.

It is also apparent that complainants are more likely to live in large cities. This is a strong indication that those who complain are do not belong to the elements in society who are likely to be disadvantaged by “unacceptable” advertising. The finding supports much anecdotal evidence presented in previous research, but the Advertising Standards Board, marketing practitioners and academics could never be certain until now. This is the study’s major strength.

It now falls to advertising professionals and marketing academics to encourage greater involvement of all members of Australian society in the current complaints process and build wider understanding of practices that contravene the regulatory system. Consumers, including the “disadvantaged”, will thereby be better protected from “unacceptable” advertising and will be more involved in the self-regulatory process (LaBarbera, 1983; Wotruba, 1997). Further, this inclusivity will ensure that the highest possible standards are the norms of the industry (Wotruba, 1997).

The direction of future research must now be to conduct in-depth studies of complainants and their responses, to ascertain the motivational, psychological, emotional and other triggers for this behaviour. Cross-cultural comparisons would also produce valuable outcomes, given the increasing globalisation of the media environment.
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Table I Recent unacceptable advertisements in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breach</th>
<th>Guilty party/case</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Case number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>Kemalco Entertainment Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Television commercial titled &quot;Rodney Rude – Ya' Mum's Ban&quot; featured jokes that the ASB ruled constituted vilification on the basis of disability and therefore breached the advertiser code</td>
<td>ASB (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>Smiths Foods</td>
<td>Animated advertisement depicting “camera-clicking” Asians touring a suburban street in a bus</td>
<td>ASB (1998a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially irresponsible</td>
<td>People’s Truth/Heartbalm</td>
<td>A billboard advertisement promoting an adults-only website failed to treat sex, sexuality and radity with sensitivity to its relevant audience, particularly given its prominent outdoor location, which effectively placed it on general exhibition to the general public</td>
<td>ASB (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misleading/deceptive/false</td>
<td>Sony Australia Limited</td>
<td>Promotional material claimed that Sony’s DRC television sets provided “four times the picture resolution of conventional screens”. The Board reasoned that average readers of the material would have limited understanding of terminology associated with digital broadcasting and found that, while average consumers might infer from the material that the picture quality is four times better than that available from a standard television set, “this is in fact not the case”</td>
<td>ASB (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Barker et al., 2001; Advertising Standards Bureau, 1998

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singh (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Kolodinsky (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td>Crosier and Erdogan (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifecycle stage</td>
<td>Crosier and Erdogan (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psychographic factor

| Personal values | Rogers and Williams (1990) |
| Personality factors | Fornell and Westbrook (1979) |
| Attitudes towards complaining | Boling (1989) |
| Bearden and Oliver (1985) |
| Singh (1990) |
| Volkov et al. (2000b) |
| Attitudes regarding business and government | Jacoby and Jarrett (1981) |
| Moyer (1984) |
| Richins (1983) |
| Personal confidence levels | Singh and Wilkes (1996) |
| Attitude to past complaining situations | Volkov et al. (2002a) |

Source: Literature reviewed in this study
Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOSAIC types</th>
<th>Complainants</th>
<th>Target %</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Base %</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01 Champagne and chardonnay</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>57,582</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02 Asset-rich commuters</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>89,347</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17 Café society</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>119,538</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03 Educated influentials</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>228,440</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22 Urban renewal</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>175,047</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04 Suburban success stories</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>113,084</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21 Cosmopolitan and cultural</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>379,739</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36 Country comforts</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>277,235</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16 Affluent apartments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>150,532</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 Blue-collar plurality</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>350,679</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07 Elevated lifestyles</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>240,079</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B06 Pools and barbies</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>177,883</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25 Elderly singles in units</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>59,983</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 Ethnic enterprise</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>283,819</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B08 Counting a future</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>239,182</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18 Oriental espresso</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>80,298</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20 Student union</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>134,789</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B37 Families on the fringe</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>284,133</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F26 Independent elders</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>280,281</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29 Retiring retreats</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>247,827</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F38 Anglo-Australian alliance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>254,090</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F38 Rural provisions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>345,273</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19 Starting out</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>123,976</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F31 Twilight zone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>80,234</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09 House and land package</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>200,832</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24 Something old, something new</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>173,007</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15 Time for change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>155,574</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G34 Safety net</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>54,680</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30 Seaside seniors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>116,879</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G32 True blue blues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>155,400</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 Villas and mansions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>125,309</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F27 Caravans and cabins</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>93,413</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23 Non-family fringe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>103,116</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 New arrivals, new hope</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>146,170</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 Close-knit and debt-free</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>109,293</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G35 Short-term parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>32,357</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Processors and paciers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>166,482</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G33 Country town challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>53,655</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05 Miners and military</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>55,665</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I40 Road-side properties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>87,635</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I41 Red earth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>126,226</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>6,229,614</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III.

Representation of groups in the complaint sample  

Source: CEASA (2002)
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