



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	394/06
2. Advertiser	Advanced Medical Institute (all nighter)
3. Product	Professional services
4. Type of advertisement	Radio
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 10 October 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This radio advertisement features a female asking “Which do you reckon a woman would choose? A guy who only lasts a couple of minutes in bed, or the guy who can go the distance. Sorry boys, a woman will pick an all nighter over a one-minute wonder every time. So if you suffer from premature ejaculation get yourself some help. Wanna be better in the bedroom? Call the doctor at AMI with their nasal delivery technology at 1800 40 20 20. You’ll last longer and she’ll love you for it. 1800 40 20 20.”

THE COMPLAINT

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

I think that this sort of advertisement could be detrimental to many men’s confidence – particularly young and less sexually experienced men, and men who may already have experienced this problem.

The lady speaks in a sultry way, but also a way that I think sounds patronising.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

There is nothing in the ad which makes it biased or patronising. The ad is encouraging people with such a problem to get help and treat this condition.

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 contravened the sections of the Code dealing with vilification/sexual discrimination.

The Board listened to the advertisement and noted the complainant’s comments that the advertisement could of itself harm a man’s confidence and affect his performance in bed. The Board did not agree and determined that even if this were the case it would not amount to the vilification of or discrimination against men in general.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement treated the matter of sex sensitively. The Board noted that the product advertised is a sex enhancement product and that products of this nature

are able to be advertised. The Board determined that the sexual references in the advertisement, whilst confronting to some members of the community, was not so offensive that it warranted removal from the air.

The Board also considered whether the language used in the advertisement was appropriate in the circumstances. The Board noted that the advertisement did not use any strong or obscene language, and that, in the context of the product advertised, that the language was not inappropriate.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.