



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 20/07 |
| 2. Advertiser | Advanced Medical Institute (Want longer lasting sex?) |
| 3. Product | Professional services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Outdoor |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
Language – use of language – section 2.5
Other - Social values |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 13 February 2007 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This outdoor advertisement features red words on a yellow background, which read "Want longer lasting sex? Nasal Delivery Technology. Call the doctors at Advanced Medical Institute 1800 20 10 10."

THE COMPLAINT

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

It is not appropriate to plaster sex-related information on billboards, in front of our children.

I find the billboard offensive as I think sex matters should be kept private.

This is a polluting form of advertising and opens the door to further degrading incidents and more deterioration.

The blatant sexual content is offensive and inappropriate.

The advertiser has aimed to attract attention by being jarringly crude...

Suffering from erectile dysfunction is a complicated issue which should be discussed with a doctor not on a roadside billboard.

I believe that to divulge details about erections, sexual pleasure and orgasms to children is exploitation. These details could be used to manipulate vulnerable children into an abusive situation.

The ad is offensive because it destroys the privacy and sanctity of sexual intercourse. It implies that sex is only about pleasure and not an expression of a personal relationship.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The ad is not sexually explicit, it is not in bad taste or offensive in any way.

The ad while considered provocative by a few of the 1000's of vehicles which have passed the Billboard is really only an endeavour to invoke/embed a self-diagnostic question and in this sense is educative and helpful to a far greater proportion of the community who respond positively to

such advertising. Most of the complaints concerned the discomfort of an adult driving with a child and being confronted by that child with a question about the message on the sign. The society that we live in and the push for more sexual awareness amongst young children has seen most schools introduce sex education in primary school (usually year 4 when the child is about 9). A prominent Australian Adolescent Psychologist Dr Michael Carr-Greig is of the view that you should start sex education confrontation of this subject as early as possible. It is in no way suggested that AMI is part of this education personally but rather that it is naive and unrealistic to think that young teenagers (8-14) are unaware of the subject nor should they be guarded from it. Overall the greater good served by such a message should prevail over the discomfort felt by a very small minority who are uncomfortable discussing the subject of sex with their children. For those parents who feel that it is not appropriate to discuss this matter with their child they as parents should be responsible for deflecting or answering their child in a way which they feel is suitable for this situation. There are many forms of advertising which include magazines, commercial and billboard which all focus on the subject of sex. If this billboard is seen to be offensive then all these other forms of advertising would also be offensive. Each parent bears the responsibility of what they do and don't tell their children - however it is not just cause for advertisers to remove all advertising relating to sex because certain parents don't wish to answer questions raised by their young children.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board considered whether the advertisement breached Section 2.3 of the code dealing with sex, sexuality and nudity.

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered the complainants' comments that the billboard was offensive.

The Board noted that the advertisement, by reason of it being a billboard, had a very broad audience, which included young people and people who may usually avoid discussion of sex or sexual matters.

The Board noted that the advertisement is for a sex-related product and that it was legitimate for such a product to mention sex. The Board noted that the billboard did not contain any graphic images and that the word 'sex' was itself not offensive. The Board acknowledged that the size of the billboard's lettering meant that the text of the advertisement would be more visible and hence would be confronting to some people. On the basis only that the advertisement was a billboard, and hence viewable by a very broad audience, the Board expressed its view that this advertisement was at the 'higher end' of what might be considered acceptable by the Australian community.

On balance however the Board held that the advertisement was not insensitive and 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.