



**ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BUREAU**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au

Case Report

1	Case Number	0022/11
2	Advertiser	Cancer Council Victoria
3	Product	Community Awareness
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Cinema
5	Date of Determination	09/02/2011
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.6 - Health and Safety within prevailing Community Standards

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement featuring a girl opens with a girl taking off a shirt at the beach, preparing to sunbake. A male voice over states, "Tanning is skin cells in trauma" and then continues to explain how a melanoma can form and spread. Images of a melanoma growing inside a body are shown during the explanation. The advertisement ends with the voice over stating, "There's nothing healthy about a tan".

THE COMPLAINT

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

My 8 year old son was stunned and sat with his mouth open terrified he has not stopped stressing about it ever since. It was on just before Megamind, a PG rated child's movie. It was extremely graphic and should not be put on with a movie aimed at a young innocent audience who take it literally and are too young to understand it is a dramatization.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Thank you for your letter dated 17 January 2011, regarding the Cancer Institute NSW Dark Side of Tanning campaign. The Victorian state-licensed Dark Side of Tanning campaign is managed by Cancer Council Victoria's SunSmart program. The Victorian campaign commenced on 28 November 2010 and will run till early March 2011. Victoria's cinema campaign component commenced on Thursday 16 December 2010 and is scheduled through to 26 January 2011.

Skin cancer is preventable by protecting the skin from damaging ultraviolet radiation (UV). Yet, Australia has the highest incidence of melanoma in the world for both males and females. In Victoria, melanoma is the fourth most common cancer in men and the third most common in women. Skin cancer cost the Australian health system more than \$300 million annually making it Australia's most expensive cancer.

The campaign aims to increase awareness of the dangers of melanoma and tanning by challenging the misconception that a tan looks healthy. The campaign prompts young adults and adolescents to reconsider their sun protection behaviour, the damage caused by unsafe exposure to the sun and their need for greater sun protection.

Adolescence and childhood are critical periods during which exposure to UV is more likely to contribute to skin cancer in later life. In young people aged 12–24 years, melanoma is the most common cancer, with more than double the number of cases of any other.

The advertisement, referred to in the complaint, is a 30-second W-rated commercial developed by the Cancer Institute NSW in 2007, through three rounds of formative research. The research identified a number of factors that were contributing to less than optimal sun protection, related to beliefs and perceptions about skin cancer and about protection behaviours. There was a belief that skin cancer is almost inevitable, based on perceptions of the high incidence of skin cancer in Australia, a substantial level of close personal experience and an acceptance of the outdoor, beach and sun culture in Australia.

The formative research also confirmed the belief that skin cancer was not considered a significant threat. Research found this stemmed from common experiences and messages of skin cancer treatment involving simple surgery. It is apparent that the prevalence and perceived relative simplicity of treatment for non-cancerous lesions and for non-melanoma skin cancer has minimised the threat.

Further, a tan was considered desirable and burning an accepted part of the process of getting a tan. Sunscreen was positioned as the primary means of sun protection. This positioning, along with poor awareness of sunscreen's mechanism of action and consequent limited knowledge of the effective way to use sunscreen, contributed to the incidence of sunburn.

The television commercial developed as a result of this research is the Dark Side of Tanning. It is "top and tailed" with a tanner moment. The female version of the commercial used in Victoria's cinema advertising features a young woman tanning on a beach. The commercial demonstrates how sun exposure damages the skin by using animation to go beyond what is visible to the human eye to reveal a unique insight – the damaging process occurring at a cell level. It corrects misconceptions by showing that damage to the skin can happen even before the skin starts to show signs of burning.

The Dark Side of Tanning previously ran between November 2009 and February 2010 in Victoria. An online tracking survey of 1,405 Victorians aged between 13-34 years showed the campaign was successful in achieving its objectives. The campaign strongly communicated its key messages relating to the severity of melanoma and the health consequences of unsafe exposure to the sun. The ad successfully challenged pro-tanning attitudes and prompted a behavioural response in relation to increasing sun protection and reducing the likelihood to suntan. Results indicated that Dark Side of Tanning was effective in Victoria:

??Six in 10 respondents said that the campaign had made them less likely to get a suntan and that they had increased or intended to increase their level of sun protection.

??People who like to tan and recalled seeing the TVC were significantly more likely to report that they planned not to tan for the remainder of the summer.

Cinema has shown to be a strong supporting campaign element and works to reach the target audience of people 13-24 years. Movie titles are selected given their relevance to the target audience and we try to avoid any films with a high proportion of children under 13 in attendance. Any titles classified "G" would be excluded.

The complaint is regarding the inclusion of the advertising during the film Megamind. This film, while being animated, is rated PG and was also used across NSW without any complaints. The inclusion of this title occurred in the first week of Victoria's cinema programming. It was not selected for subsequent weeks.

Given the complaint we have acted quickly and requested our media-buying agency to restrict all animation films for the remainder of the campaign and to be more cautious in their selection of titles.

I hope that the Advertising Standards Bureau will appreciate that this campaign is helping to educate young people about the dangers of overexposure to the sun. By changing their behaviour now, they can significantly decrease their risk of melanoma.

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 graphic and could be upsetting to some viewers, particularly children who may be too young to understand the dramatization.

The Board reviewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.6 of the Code. Section 2.6 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety".

The Board noted the advertiser's response that the advertisement aims to increase awareness of the dangers of melanoma and tanning by challenging the misconception that a tan looks healthy. The Board noted that the advertisement was not shown in G rated films and was to avoid films with a high proportion of children under 13 years.

The Board noted that the advertisement was shown during the film Megamind (rated PG) in the first week of Victoria's cinema programming and was not selected for subsequent weeks.

The Board considered that the value of the sun safety message contained in the advertisement outweighed any distress it may cause to some viewers and the depiction was therefore justified in the context of that message. Based on the above, the Board determined that the

advertisement did not depict material contrary to prevailing community standards on health and safety and did not breach section 2.6 of the Code.

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