



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 156/03 |
| 2. Advertiser | Mitsubishi Motots Australia Ltd (Triton Ute) |
| 3. Product | Vehicles |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Language – use of language – section 2.5 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 10 June 2003 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement is located in and around a workshop where the new owner of a Triton Ute extols the virtues of the vehicle to a mate over the noise and movement of various tools which block out indicated swearing. The advertisement ends with the two men laughing together alongside the vehicle, with superimposed Mitsubishi signage and a caption reading: ‘New Triton Turbo Diesel.’

THE COMPLAINT

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

“The continued use of fowl (sic) language. Though blotted with various sound effects, it is still quite clear what it is that they are saying.”

“Because of the implicit filthy language...Leaving kids out of the argument, I personally find the ad offensive.”

“...the ‘F’ word is clearly meant to be part of the conversation...”

“I find the wording of the advertisement unacceptable, offensive words are conveniently ‘deleted’...”

“There is obvious swearing used in this advertising...”

*“...they imply the use of foul language such as f*** etc. This is done in an overt manner leaving no doubt as to what the words are meant to be.”*

“Very poor attempt at trying to cover up gratuitous use of offensive language which has no relation to the product or manufacturer.”

“So poorly camouflaged are the swear words that my 3-year old could tell me that the men were saying ‘bad words.’ It’s a disgrace.”

“We have enough bad language in general use without getting more in commercials.”

“I find this offensive...The standard of advertising for products and in television and in radio shows these days seems to have been flushed down the toilet never to be seen again.”

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

Acknowledging the advertiser's advice that there was no intent to offend and that the material was designed to communicate with a target audience 'in their very own vernacular,' the Board noted that nowhere within the advertisement could the two featured men be seen or heard to be swearing.

Consequently, it was determined that that the material did not offend the Code in relation to the use of language.

Finding that the advertisement did not otherwise breach the Code, the Board dismissed the complaint.