



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	287/01
2. Advertiser	TEAC Aust Pty Ltd
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	Outdoor
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 November 2001
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS

The two advertisements submitted feature photographs of women together with TEAC audio equipment. In one, the woman is wearing a dress, sitting on the floor alongside the TEAC unit under the headline: “Personally, I prefer small.” Accompanying text reads: “There are some girls who prefer small...Like the TEAC Reference 100 Micro System, a small system that performs just like a big one. It only takes up the space of a pair of shoes. Yet it reproduces the full musical spectrum that will put a lot of bigger systems to shame. So don’t worry about the small size. It’s the quality that counts.” In the second advertisement, the woman is partly clad in a top and mini skirt made of a camouflage-design material. She is shown standing next to another TEAC sound system, holding an automatic rifle and wearing a necklace made of bullets. Below a headline reading: “Seriously Well Equipped,” text states: “What a pair. They both mean serious business. The TEAC Reference 300 now has a choice of three separates from Receiver to CDRW and CD. You can build your own personal system and discover true separates performance from a mini system. Or you can try your luck with the girl, M16 and 34D cup. Whatever is your preference, they’re both seriously well-equipped.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant made regarding these advertisements included the following:

‘There are multiple copies of the ad, posted at eye-level above the men’s urinals...Apart from being an insult to the average person’s intelligence, the ad is offensive in the extreme. It is quite clearly an attempt to promote a product using sexist imagery and language. It is debasing to the woman in the picture and—by extension—to all women...I think the military imagery is extremely inappropriate at the moment...The second TEAC ad...I didn’t find so offensive—just puerile and banal.’

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether these advertisements breach Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

The Board noted advice from the advertiser that the advertisements were reviewed by Qantas management before placement in their Melbourne Airport bathrooms during the months of September and October 2001.

The Board determined that, within the context of prevailing community standards, the advertisements did not contravene the Code in relation to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity and did not constitute a breach of the Code in the area of health and safety.

Finding that the advertisements did not contravene any aspect of the Code, the Board dismissed the

complaint.