



Case Report

1	Case Number	0155/15
2	Advertiser	Ultra Tune Australia
3	Product	Automotive
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Cinema
5	Date of Determination	13/05/2015
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women
- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Two women wearing rubber outfits (one wearing a dress, the other wearing a catsuit) climb out of a car and walk in to an Ultra Tune workshop where one of the women slams her whip on the counter to attract the attention of the man sitting behind it.

The man nods and smiles at the women and text appears on screen which reads, "The word is out we're now in to rubber" and we see the women caressing some car tyres.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Its completely demeaning to women, uses models with low self esteem who have had all sorts of surgery wearing S&m gear. Perpetuates the sexism of auto shops and why women fear going in there and continues to make men think of women in purely derogatory sexual terms.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

We refer to your email letter of 14 April 2015 attaching a complaint about our advertisement before the 7:30pm screening of Fast and Furious 7 at Village Cinemas on 13 April 2015.

The 30 second advertisement is of two women arriving at an Ultra Tune workshop dressing in black figure hugging clothing demanding tyres. The advertisement is to promote tyres from Ultra Tune.

We purchase the advertising spots directly with Val Morgan Cinema network.

We advise that a copy of the relevant advertisements can be seen at our YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlaNI10JCc> entitled "Ultra Tune Tyre Advert – 30 Second Version". The CAD reference number is PZN6MROA and has a PG rating.

We respond to the issues raised by the complainant (2 of the Code) as follows:

1. The models are fully clothed. The images do not portray nor suggest sex or sexual act and are not being portrayed as objects of lust. The images do not include any graphic nudity and there is no uncovered flesh.

2. The advertisement commercial is deliberately exaggerated and unrealistic in its nature which is emphasised by the black and white filming style that is used.

3. The male attendant makes no degrading remarks or looks at the women when they enter the shop. He simply raises his eyes to acknowledge them and then nods with understanding that they are after tyres. We refute the suggestion that it objectifies or degrades women.

4. The women were treated fairly during the production and were remunerated for their performance.

5. The advertisement is not designed for children and is screened before a movie that is classified with M classification. We enclose a copy of the Village Cinemas description of the movie and the webpage regarding classifications from the Village Cinemas website.

6. We also refer to case number 0201/14 and 0380/13 where the complaints were dismissed.

We do not believe the advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Advertisers Code of Ethics in any way.

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 is sexualised and demeaning to women.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.1 of the Code which requires that 'advertisements shall not portray or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual preference, religion, disability, mental illness or political belief.'

The Board noted it had previously dismissed complaints about the same advertisement for television in case 0201/14 where:

"The Board noted that the advertisement features two women wearing rubber outfits (one wearing a dress, the other wearing a catsuit) walking into an Ultra Tune workshop where one of the women slams her whip on the counter to attract the attention of the man sitting behind it. The women are seen caressing some car tyres."

In the current advertisement the Board noted that it had been viewed at the Cinema ahead of the movie Fast and Furious 7 which is rated M.

The Board noted the complainants concerns that the advertisement perpetuates the sexism of auto shops and why women fear going in there. The Board considered that not all women fear going into mechanical shops and that the women depicted in this advertisement are not intimidated at all and are confident and comfortable approaching the shop and the male service man.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not depict material in a way that discriminates against or vilifies a person on account of their gender and did not breach section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code states: "Advertising or marketing communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people."

The Board noted that in order to be in breach of this section of the Code the image would need to use sexual appeal in a manner that is both exploitative and degrading.

The Board noted that it had considered an advertisement for Innerware (ref: 0380/13) where a woman entered a workshop dressed in lingerie. In this advertisement, the Board considered that "the depiction of a woman in her lingerie walking in to a male dominated tyre fitting shop is a purposeful use of her sexual appeal to attract the attention of the viewer to the product being advertised. The Board noted that the woman deliberately dressed in a manner that will attract the attention of the employees of the workshop and that she appears to be enjoying the attention of the men who work there. The Board considered that although the advertisement does use sexual appeal, it is not portrayed in a manner that is exploitative and degrading to women."

Consistent with the decision above, in the current advertisement, the Board considered that the depiction of the two women strutting into the workshop portrays the women as powerful and confident and their depiction wearing rubber suits is relevant to the new range of 'rubber' tyres in store and does not amount to a depiction that is exploitative and degrading to women and did not breach section 2.2 of the Code."

The Board considered in this instance that the advertisement does not depict women in a manner which is exploitative and degrading and determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience".

The Board noted that the advertisement is for tyres and tyre fitting and that the idea is to draw the attention of the viewer to the tyres. The Board noted that it is unlikely that anyone would behave in the same manner around tyres but that the actions of the women are exaggerated and unrealistic in a humorous way and are only mildly sexually suggestive.

The Board noted that the advertisement had been viewed at the Cinema ahead of the movie Fast and Furious 7 which is rated M. The Board noted that the likely audience of the movie Fast and Furious would be teens and young adults and that the images are not inappropriately sexualised and that it does treat the issue of sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code. Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.