



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	241/06
2. Advertiser	Emap Australia (Zoo - propeller)
3. Product	Media
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Violence Other – section 2.2
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 11 July 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement is set at Bankstown Airport where a group of passengers is heading across the tarmac, directed by a hostess to board a plane through the rear door. One man, wearing headphones and engrossed in his Zoo magazine, inadvertently veers towards the front of the plane towards the propellers which are in operation. We hear the sound of an interrupted propeller as a male voiceover warns “Mondays aren’t safe anymore”.

THE COMPLAINT

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

....walking into planes and being chopped up.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

(Free TV Australia)...direction was taken on the visuals and audio (the “propeller” sounds) to ensure the advertisement was suitable for a PG time zone.

The advertisement portrays an over-exaggerated scenario of a plane passenger walking into a plane’s propeller. This is intended to be a humorous and clearly unreal reflection of the engaging content within the magazine.

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 that the advertisement does not portray the person walking into the propeller, there is no graphic imagery such as blood and it is really to the viewer’s imagination to image that the person reading the magazine has walked into the airplane’s propeller.

The Board considered that the advertisement’s implied violence did not breach section 2.2 of the Code, but that the advertisement was in poor taste and would offend some people. The Board noted that the advertiser was willing to modify the advertisement and hoped that it would do so of its own volition.

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