



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 224/03 |
| 2. Advertiser | Johnson & Johnson Pacific Pty Ltd (Barely There) |
| 3. Product | Toiletries |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 8 July 2003 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a young woman walking along the street, addressing the camera, saying: “My grandma told me to always wear fresh underwear in case I got hit by a bus.” As her eyes are attracted to a young man, she adds: “I can think of a much better reason.” The view changes to show a product pack, and then to a close-up of the product being twisted back and forth as the young woman’s voice continues: “Stay fresh even between periods with new Carefree Barely There liners. They are so amazingly comfortable and flexible they feel barely there.” The young woman is next shown about to cross a road. Looking back at the young man who had attracted her attention, she narrowly avoids being hit by a bus. The advertisement ends with a view of the back of the bus carrying Barely There advertising and a voiceover saying: “Feel fresh all day, everyday, with Carefree Barely There.”

THE COMPLAINT

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

“This ad implies that if women don’t use their product, which happens to be Carefree Panty Liners, we will not be ‘Fresh!’ This is an affront and insidiously sneaky—give us a complex and we will buy their products no less.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

Noting research information provided by the advertiser, the Board determined that the content of this advertisement did not constitute discrimination and/or vilification as represented in the Code.

The Board further determined that the material did not contravene the Code on any grounds and dismissed the complaint accordingly.