



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 111/07 |
| 2. Advertiser | Ford Motor Co Aust Pty Ltd (Fiesta) |
| 3. Product | Vehicles |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Print |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 10 April 2007 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement features a male and female in white coats in a large laboratory, standing with their backs to the camera, looking at a clay model they have made of a Ford Fiesta. The man's white coat has a clay handprint on his buttock.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I find it to be sending out the wrong message for modern society mainly because when people go to work they go to a harassment or sexual free zone, personally I think that this was the wrong way to market their cars. In this ad, myself and my family feel that it is promoting wrong work ethics as I know that when I go to work this kind of behaviour does not happen and I am sure that the actions acted out in the ad and the print do not coincide with the actual designers line of work.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

The launch of the new Ford Fiesta is built around the notion of "German engineering just got sexier" based on its product attributes of sleek Euro design and german heritage. The advertising idea is a visual demonstration of this. The TVC scenario is highly embellished and a parody of the movie "Ghost" intended to be humorous and engaging. The commercial is by no means representative of real life events.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ("Board") first considered this advertisement under the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries' Advertising for Motor Vehicles Voluntary Code of Practice (the "FCAI Code"). The Board considered that the advertisement did not breach the FCAI Code in any way.

The Board then considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the "Code").

The Board considered the complainant's comments that advertisement depicted sexual harassment and considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.3 of the code dealing with sex, sexuality and nudity.

The Board felt that the depiction of the hand print on the man's behind was a humorous reference

intended to break the stereotype of the 'stitched-up', unattractive German engineer. Given the passive stances of the characters depicted, the Board did not agree that there was definitive evidence of an unwanted sexual advance, hence there was no direct evidence of sexual harrassment.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.