



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	206/04
2. Advertiser	Enjo Pty Ltd
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Other - Causes alarm and distress to children
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 10 August 2004
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features a woman in her bathroom who turns around and is shocked to see a beheaded ghost figure whose head is on her bathroom bench top. The body of the ghost cleans with an Enjo glove while the woman looks on in shock. The tagline is “Easy to use. Hard to believe.”

THE COMPLAINT

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

“This is every woman’s most frightening time. We all imagine being attacked when we are most vulnerable.”

“This is extremely offensive and I am disgusted that this depicts a beheaded male when currently in Iraq we have innocent civilians being beheaded on an almost daily basis.”

“What kind of fright could this give a child, not to mention nightmares if seen regularly during these sorts of timeslots.”

“I found this advertisement offensive as it has the potential to scare children (and adults), and a headless man does not have any relevance to selling the product.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“The advertising is intended to be surprising and amusing; that a ghost could miraculously appear in an everyday Australian home, do a simple product demonstration, and then disappear.”

“The dialogue relates solely to ENJO products, and does not suggest any violence or threat to the surprised householder.”

“The campaign is targeted to adults – who are responsible for the household cleaning. The media schedule has been bought accordingly, and following guidelines set out by FACTS. We have not bought spots in any programs aimed at 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 was of the view that in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not find this advertisement offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to alarm and distress to children.

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