



Case Report

1	Case Number	0319/15
2	Advertiser	Mitsubishi Motors Aust Ltd
3	Product	Vehicle
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	12/08/2015
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features a woman fussing over a poodle and asking it to "be good for daddy". We see a man sitting on the porch looking unimpressed as the woman continues to ask him to walk the dog and give her a bath.

We then hear a car horn beeping and see a Mitsubishi being lowered over the poodle's kennel. The dog runs out the way but the kennel is flattened. The man says, "It's a Mitsi" and the occupants of the car agree then invite the man to join them. We then see the Mitsubishi driving to a pier with a boat.

THE COMPLAINT

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

These adverts are blatantly sexist and present women as superficial. The men are overtly blokey and it also presents the idea that destruction of property is both cool and funny. I believe that it is showing that having no respect for the woman/women in your life is acceptable and normal. When both men ignore the women's instructions in order to go off with 'the boys' it presents the kind of ingrained mentality that we need to get rid of in Australia. There is no balance in their advertising as no men are ever seen fussing over anything while a lady stands idly by until her friends drop in. I personally own a 4WD and love getting out and having an adventure with friends (both male and female) and find it

offensive that in this day and age women are still made out to only have interests in their appearance and tiny dogs. We are not one dimensional flouncy fools. Men cannot be shown that running away instead of communicating is an acceptable way to be in a relationship either. I am raising a boy, who I do not want exposed to this kind of archaic attitude towards women. I hope you can appreciate my point of view and ban these adverts.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

In no respect does the Mitsubishi Motors Australia Triton advertisement contravene section 2 of the AANA code of ethics, be that in relation to discrimination, vilification, exploitation violence, sexuality, nudity, sex or degrading of any individual or group. In the realms of fantasy a vehicle parachutes from the sky landing in the back yard at which time a person who is sitting on the porch leaves to join the participants in the vehicle.

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 sexist and demeaning to both men and 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 this television advertisement features a woman fussing over a poodle and asking the dog to be "good for daddy" as the woman is heading out or away. The man is sitting on a chair and watches as his mates arrive in a Mitsubishi dropped on the dog house and asking him to join them. The car is seen at a pier with a boat and all the men and the dog. The Board noted it had previously dismissed complaints about an advertisement by the same advertiser in case 0245/15 where:

"The Board noted the complainant's concern that the women are portrayed as doing a 'girly activity' which the man has to endure because his partner is 'controlling and boring' but considered that this interpretation is unlikely to be shared by the broader community. The Board considered that the most likely interpretation is that the man is uncomfortable doing the yoga and welcomes the chance to leave the class when his mates arrive, but there is no suggestion that he was forced to go by his partner or that his partner is controlling him."

In the current advertisement the Board noted the complainant's concern that the way the characters are presented is sexist and particularly disrespectful to women presenting them as superficial.

The Board noted that the idea of women caring for and pampering pets and men not liking it is one that most members of the community would agree is generalised but realistic. The Board noted that the characters are portrayed in gender stereotypical roles with the woman

dressed in brightly coloured clothes and appearing 'over the top' and having the dog equally as accessorised. The man is portrayed as being more masculine and likely to prefer the more masculine idea of spending times with mates and heading out on the boat to fish or similar activity.

The Board noted that the roles are stereotypical but that advertisers are permitted to use gender stereotyping as long as it is not used in a negative way and does not amount to a depiction that could be considered discrimination.

Similar to the matter mentioned above, the Board considered that the most likely interpretation is that the man is uncomfortable and disinterested in caring for and bathing the dog as requested and welcomes the chance to leave the class when his mates arrive. The Board noted that although the dog house is crushed and the man is not seen bathing the dog as requested, he has taken the dog with him on the trip and not left the dog unattended or alone.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not portray or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of their gender.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not portray or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of their gender.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

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