



**Ad Standards** Community Panel  
PO Box 5110, Braddon ACT 2612  
P (02) 6173 1500 | F (02) 6262 9833

[AdStandards.com.au](http://AdStandards.com.au)

Advertising Standards Bureau Limited  
ACN 084 452 666

# Case Report

1	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0401/18</b>
2	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>AAMI</b>
3	<b>Product</b>	<b>Insurance</b>
4	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>TV - Free to air</b>
5	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>26/09/2018</b>
6	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

## ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features a family of four sitting on the couch, wearing 3D glasses watching a movie. It's a Fast and the Furious type car chase. The family react in unison as the action unfolds. As the car takes a corner on TV, the family all shift their weight to the right. Then, the sound effects get louder and louder— and a real car comes crashing through the living room and takes out the TV. It's a pizza delivery car. The mother removes her glasses to assess the damage. She realises this isn't part of the show. An AAMI girl then appears to help the mother track her insurance claim online. The father, still wearing the glasses, reaches a hand towards the car and says "it's like he's actually in the room".

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*Vilifies, demeans and belittles adult males making the father look stupid when a car crashes through a wall while he wears 3D glasses saying it's like he's in the room with us.*



*Men are not stupid and would it have the same affect of supposedly being funny if a female said it?*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*We would like to address the concerns and provide some commentary relating to our advertising approach in the recent '3D Movie Night' TVC, in particular section 2.6 of the AANA Code of Ethics.*

*At your request and to alleviate any other concerns, we will address all of section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics.*

### *2.1 - Discrimination or vilification*

*At no point during any AAMI advertising do we portray people or depict material in a way which could be discriminatory, nor do we set out to vilify people or sections of the community.*

*Whilst we acknowledge the complaint received regarding our '3D Movie Night' TV advertisement, we certainly did not set out to vilify, demean or belittle adult males in any way, nor do we feel that this was a consequence or outtake from the advertisement. Often in AAMI advertising (as with a lot of other advertising) humour is used to engage with our audience and make our advertising memorable. The humour in this instance comes from the unbelievable situation the family finds themselves in, coupled with the line delivered by a character 'it's like he's actually in the room'. The humour is not related to the father character who delivers the line, as the complainant mentioned, this would be equally as funny if the mother had delivered the line, or the son or the daughter. It just so happens in this instance that the father delivers the line.*

### *2.2 - Exploitative and degrading*

*At no point during this advertisement (or any AAMI content) do we employ scenarios or actions which exploit or degrade individuals or groups of people.*

### *2.3 – Violence*

*At no point during this advertisement (or any AAMI content) do we depict violent situations, nor do we encourage violence in any shape or form, and this is reflected in our CAD rating for this particular commercial.*

### *2.4 - Sex, sexuality and nudity*

*AAMI's advertising will never include sex, sexuality or nudity.*

### *2.5 – Language*



*The advertisement in question has no strong or obscene language and only uses language appropriate to the audience.*

#### *2.6 - Health and Safety*

*The advertisement in question does not contain any material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety.*

#### *2.7 – Distinguishable as advertising*

*The advertisement in question is clearly distinguishable as advertising and there have been no attempts to disguise it as otherwise. This is most evident through the strong presence of the AAMI logo and branded end-frame, brand music, branded characters and the language used.*

*We take all complaints we receive very seriously so we appreciate you raising the issue with us.*

*Please feel free to get in contact should you have any questions.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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 vilifying men.

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

The Panel 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 Panel noted that this television advertisement features a family watching a 3D movie when a pizza delivery car drives through the wall behind the TV. The mother removes her glasses and an AAMI employee arrives to help assess the damage. The father reaches a hand towards the car and comments, "It's like he's really in the room".

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement vilifies, demeans and belittles adult males.

The Panel noted the Practice Note to Section 2.1 provides the following definitions:



“Discrimination – unfair or less favourable treatment.

Vilification – humiliates, intimidates, incites hatred, contempt or ridicule.”

The Panel considered that the scenario in the advertisement was unrealistic and unlikely to be taken seriously by most members of the community.

The Panel considered that the man in the advertisement wasn’t seen to represent all adult males, rather he was a single character making a humorous comment.

The Panel considered that the humour in the advertisement was from the comment itself, and was not related to the gender of the person making the comment.

The Panel considered that the man was not shown to receive unfair or less favourable treatment, and while he was shown in a humorous light, he was not humiliated or ridiculed because of his gender.

The Panel 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 gender and determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code

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

