



## Case Report

1	Case Number	0180/10
2	Advertiser	Australian National Prescription Service
3	Product	Health Products
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Print
5	Date of Determination	12/05/2010
6	DETERMINATION	Upheld - Modified or Discontinued

### ISSUES RAISED

- 2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience
- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement with large coloured copy 'Sex! Harder! Longer! Stronger! Do you want longer lasting, better sex?' includes Q&A items on such things as erectile dysfunction and premature ejaculation. An image of a woman dressed in lingerie and helmet is posed beside the copy with ANPS logo and toll free number.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*The ad was placed in a newspaper that is distributed to the general public. Due to the fact that the ad is primarily targeting males to help treat issues that 'all men will experience at some stage' this ad is not sensitive to the audience (which could include children teenagers and women). In addition neither the feature title nor the photograph deals explicitly with the product or service the Australian National Prescription Service (ANPS) is trying to sell. The size bold colours and blatant message of the ad also make it very confronting to any reader of 'The Examiner'.*

*Women's Forum acknowledges that this ad is trying to deal with a medical disorder or a male health issue (as the Australian Medical Institute has claimed in the past about similar advertising) but the words 'SEX!HARDER!LONGER! STRONGER!' Do you want longer lasting sex?' are not medical or clinical in nature but refer to a sexual act. Nor does the photograph have any medical or clinical relevance. This treatment of sex has been shown to*

*be 'insensitive' and unacceptable to the community in the past. We note that the ASB has upheld complaints about similar advertisement by a similar organisation (1).*

*As an independent think tank that conducts research into issues relevant to women we wish to emphasise the detrimental effects sexualised advertising can have on the physical emotional and sexual health of women and young girls. The sexualised posturing of the female promotes the idea that women are purely sexual objects. Research suggest that portraying women as sex objects may contributed to broader societal consequences such as sexism sex bias sexist attitudes and violence against girls and women (2). Any ad that reinforces the view that women are valued primarily for their sexual availability or willingness is detrimental to the healthy development of woman and young girls. Due to the fact that the ANPS is primarily targeting males to 'help treat the three key issues that men will experience at some stage' Women's forum submits that the inclusion of a sexualised female in the ad is inappropriate.*

*We understand that this is simply one ad but the cumulative effect of such advertising whether in newspapers on billboards or in magazines reinforces the view that women are valued primarily for their sexual attributes. This view pervades society to its detriment and advertising can and does influence this view of women.*

*This ad does not treat sex and sexuality with sensitivity having regard to the general audience of the newspaper. It is in breach of S2.3 of the Advertising Code of Ethics. We submit that the ad should not be republished or alterntive only published with significant modifications.*

*(1)for example: complaint ref 278/08; 418/09; 414/09; 219/09*

*(2) American Psychological Association Report of the APA Task force on the Sexualization of Grils (Washington DC: American Psychological Association 2007) pg3.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*The advertiser declined to provide a response. A copy of the advertisement was obtained from the publisher.*

## **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 concerns that the advertisement treats sex without due sensitivity to the possible child, teenage and female audience.

The Board noted that part of the complaint concerns a lack of detail in the advertisement about what the advertised product is. The Board noted that this is an issue that is not within the Board's jurisdiction.

The Board noted the content of the advertisement and reviewed this advertisement under Section 2.3 of the Code which states: Advertising and Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone.

The Board noted that advertising a sex related product is not prohibited in Australia but that such advertisements must comply with the Code of Ethics.

The Board noted that the predominant feature of the advertisement is text in bold colours which states 'Sex! Harder! Longer! Stronger! Followed by 'do you want longer lasting, better sex?'

The Board noted that these references to sex, and achieving good sex were not of themselves necessarily unable to be used in advertising, and that advertisements dealing with a medical disorder or a male health issue may require some of this content. However the Board determined that the words 'Sex! Harder! Longer! Stronger!', followed by 'Do you want longer lasting, better sex' were not medical or clinical in nature and were in fact a blatant message about a sexual act. The Board also noted that section 2.3 of the Code does require that sexual references are treated with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Board noted that this advertisement had been placed in a newspaper in a tourism feature and considered it likely that there would be a primarily adult readership for this paper.

The Board noted that this particular advertisement also includes an image of a woman wearing a bikini, possibly riding a motorbike and wearing a motorbike helmet. The woman's mouth is hidden. The Board noted that the complainant expressed concerns that the woman is in a sexualised position and that this image promotes the idea that women are purely sexual objects.

The Board considered that this image, in conjunction with the explicit sexual message alongside the image, was a sexualised or sexually suggestive image and that this advertisement as a whole presented a highly sexualised advertisement that did not treat sex and sexuality in a manner that is sensitive to the general audience of the publication in the location in which it was published in the paper.

The Board determined that this advertisement did not treat sex, sexuality or nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and determined that the advertisement breached section 2.3 of the Code. Finding that the advertisement was in breach of the Code the Board upheld the complaint.

## **ADVERTISER RESPONSE TO DETERMINATION**

It is duly noted that the ad appearing with “female in Helmut” will not be running again. ANPS Pty Ltd have taken all relevant steps in removing the ad as disclosed and assure that it will not run again.