



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 100/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Oz Spy |
| 3. Product | Housegood/services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Cinema |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Race – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 11 April 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This cinema advertisement for Oz Spy Surveillance Equipment features eerie music and a male voiceover asking “Who’s watching your home or office when you’re not?”. An accompanying image shows the face of a man appearing to be of Pacific-island heritage alongside an image of a business woman and business man engaged in conversation. The advertisement continues with a series of depictions of security systems and the voiceover describes the services and equipment offered by Oz Spy.

THE COMPLAINT

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

...my partner happens to be a Maori...He said out loud in disgust exactly what I was thinking... how racist!!! Why is it necessary to illustrate an intruder as a black person?

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

If required I will organise to have the image changed.

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 Code requires that ‘advertisement not portray people ...in a way that vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race.’

The Board noted that the beginning of the advertisement depicted a dark skinned man alongside an image of office workers underneath the banner ‘who’s watching your home or office when you’re not?’

The Board noted the complainant’s concern that the advertisement depicted the dark skinned man as a potential thief. Having viewed the advertisement, however, the Board was of the view that the fleeting image did not clearly portray the man as either a potential thief or as a person who is part of the security company.

In light of the fact that the advertisement did not make any clear representation of the man as a thief, the Board did not consider that the advertisement portrayed a person in a way that vilified a section of the community on account of their ethnicity or race.

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