



Case Report

1	Case Number	0172/11
2	Advertiser	Coty Australia Pty Ltd
3	Product	Toiletries
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	25/05/2011
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A man is shown spraying his torso with Playboy deodorant and then we see him confidently talking to a group of people at a party. He leaves with a woman and the voice over says he has scored and we see them in bed together, both wearing their underwear.

THE COMPLAINT

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

The crass sexual content - that the young man smelling good resulted in him scoring sex; the other one- actually showing them in bed together; the advertiser itself being a global pornography franchise; and the fact that all this took place during a program that appeals to families in a prime time slot.

Aside from the obviously morally bereft content of inducing audiences to consider sex as an act of scoring is there also an avenue of complaint where I can have redress with Coty Australia Pty Ltd if the product does not do what it purports to do in this case enable a person to have sex? (The nudity of the couple lying horizontally ensured that I would not mistake that the product was referring to a game of cricket.)

The ad has very obvious references to sex and is played in a PG rated timeslot. Apart from the fact that playboy is a porn label the final scene of the add relates that the man wearing the product has got lucky and shows a couple in bed in underwear clearly about to have sex. It is not an obscure reference that only an adult would recognise. It is a clear reference to sexual intercourse.

The advertisement made no reference to being a deodorant and yet it is found in the men's deodorant section of Coles supermarkets (due to a strategically placed logo at the end of the ad).

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The Playboy ad is a global ad created by our international company and has been shown widely across the globe including USA. On submission we were approved with a PG rating in Australia and therefore our media agency bought within the guidelines of this rating.

The ad has been created to be a play on the life of a Playboy, but in a humorous way. It "plays" on the idea that the confidence gained by the use of the Playboy body spray, lets you get through "life's little accidents".

Playboy is licensed to many brand categories in Australia, from soft drinks to umbrellas. It is a global mainstream brand.

The product was shown as a deodorant spray both when the male sprayed it and also at the closing scene when the cans were on display. It is assumed that the audience understands the "play on words".

The models in the ad are at no time nude, or indulging in a sexual act. All scenes are shot tastefully and in a fun lighthearted way.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standard Board ('the Board') considered whether the advertisement complied with the AANA Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board noted the complainants' concerns that this advertisement features obvious references to sex and shows a couple in their underwear on a bed about to have sex.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 states: '...shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone'.

The Board noted that the advertisement shows a man and woman embracing on a bed whilst the accompanying voice over says that the man has scored, with the implication being that using Playboy deodorant has helped the man attract the woman.

The Board considered that the image of the couple on the bed was a minor part of the advertisement and noted that this advertisement has been rated PG by CAD. The Board

considered that the content of the advertisement was suitable for the PG rating and that most members of the community would find the advertisement to not be inappropriate.

Based on the above the Board determined that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it did not breach Section 2.3 of the Code.

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