

Case Report

1. Case Number :	0128-25
2. Advertiser :	Adelaide Cylinder Heads, Just Heads Performance
3. Product :	Automotive
4. Type of Advertisement/Media :	Billboard
5. Date of Decision:	18-Jun-2025
6. Decision:	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.4 Sex/sexuality/nudity
AANA Code of Ethics\2.5 language

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This billboard advertisement features the words "The best head jobs in town. Adelaide cylinder heads", along with a contact number for the business. The words "Just heads performance" are also featured to the right of the billboard.



THE COMPLAINT

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

*The ad is in a public place of footpath main Rd of Port Rd
can indeed be seen by all members of the public including families of young children.*

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

This company has been operating since 1991 & have been using this phrase to advertise our Cylinder Head businesses since the beginning & prior to that was used by Coulthard Welding Co. It is the phrase used in our 2 businesses, Adelaide Cylinder Heads & Just Heads Performance when dealing with mechanics or the general public in regard to talking to us about our Cylinder Head Job services. When a cylinder head is removed from the engine & needs to be repaired, restored or have performance upgrades the terminology for this work is a Head Job is required.

We have not had any complaints throughout the 30+ years we have been in business & it is part of the identity & advertising for our well-known local business. It would be disappointing & a shame to remove our advertising after all these years of positive feedback from all the people that we have dealt with. You can never please everybody in the community & it's unfortunate that someone has found our company's advertising offensive. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our businesses advertising & I hope you will take my response to this matter into consideration.

THE DECISION

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the Panel) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement is inappropriate for a broad audience that includes children.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response.

Section 2.4: Advertising shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Panel noted the Practice Note for the Code states:

"Full frontal nudity and explicit pornographic language are not permitted."

Does the advertisement contain sex?

The Panel considered whether the advertisement contained a depiction of sex. The Panel noted the definition of sex in the Practice Note is "sexual intercourse; person or persons engaged in sexually stimulating behaviour".

The Panel noted that the term “head job” can refer to oral sex, and this is a reference to sex.

Does the advertisement contain sexuality?

The Panel noted the definition of sexuality in the Practice Note is “the capacity to experience and express sexual desire; the recognition or emphasis of sexual matters”.

The Panel considered that the advertisement features sexual innuendo and contained sexuality.

Does the advertisement contain nudity?

The Panel noted that the definition of nudity in the Practice Note is “the depiction of a person without clothing or covering; partial or suggested nudity may also be considered nudity”.

The Panel noted the advertisement does not include images of people and does not contain nudity.

Are the issues of sex and sexuality treated with sensitivity to the relevant audience?

The Panel noted that the definition of sensitivity in the Practice Note is “understanding and awareness to the needs and emotions of others”.

The Panel noted that assessing whether sexual suggestion is ‘sensitive to the relevant audience’ requires consideration of who the relevant audience is and how they are likely to react to or feel about the advertisement.

The Panel noted that the advertisement is on a billboard and the relevant audience would be broad. The Panel noted the advertiser’s response that “head job” is a term that refers to services available. The Panel noted that while this also has a sexualised meaning, there is no other sexual imagery or wording which would make the advertisement explicitly sexual.

The Panel considered that the sexual innuendo in the advertisement was mild and had another meaning routinely relevant to the services provided by the business. The Panel considered that the sex, sexuality, and nudity in the advertisement was treated with sensitivity to the relevant broad audience.

Section 2.4 conclusion

The Panel found that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

Section 2.5: Advertising shall only use language which is appropriate in the circumstances (including appropriate for the relevant audience and medium). Strong or obscene language shall be avoided.

The Panel noted the Practice Note for this section of the Code includes:

“Advertising that uses sexualised double entendre will often be seen to not breach the Code when there is a non-sexualised interpretation which would be understood by children viewing the advertisement.”

Consistent with the determination under Section 2.4, the Panel considered that the sexual innuendo in the advertisement was mild and had another meaning routinely relevant to the services provided by the business. The Panel considered that the language in the advertisement was appropriate in the circumstances and was not strong or obscene.

Section 2.5 conclusion

The Panel considered that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.5 of the Code.

Conclusion

Finding that the advertisement did not breach any other section of the Code the Panel dismissed the complaint.