



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 43/10  |
| 2. Advertiser                 | PZ Cussons   |
| 3. Product                    | Housegoods/services  |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | Print  |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3<br>Other - Social values |
| 6. Date of determination      | Wednesday, 10 February 2010  |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed  |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This print advertisement features a child's drawing on a tablecloth depicting a mummy and plumber holding hands and daddy off to the side. The advertisement is for the sale of fabric cleaner.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*The advertisement implies (and not at all subtly) an extra marital sexual relationship. It is on the back cover of a family magazine which would be sitting in households able to be seen by children of any age at any time without supervision.*

*The advertisement trivialises adultery. It implies this is commonplace and does not indicate that it is unacceptable behaviour, just that it should be done secretly.*

*It offends those of us who hold strongly to faithfulness within marriage and strong family values.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*Thank you for your email dated January 25, 2010, regarding the complaints made against the Promotional campaign for DUO liquid Washing Detergent. We understand that our campaign is somewhat different to other washing detergent communication. Addressing the specific area of complaint relating to section 2 (2.3) of the AANA Code of Ethics:*

*"Advertising and marketing communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone." "The two executions in this campaign are intended to draw a link between the washing performance of DUO Liquid And the promotion prize - Crayola Washable Markers. It is intended to be a humorous dramatisation of children drawing what they see regardless of the content. Anyone with children knows that from time to time they say and draw the strangest things. With DUO and Crayola Washable Markers, if you don't like what is drawn, you can simply wash it clean. This is dramatised in two executions by depicting a less than flattering drawing of mum with three eyes and mummy holding hands with the 'plumber'. The executions are intended to play to a well trodden cliché. We are in no way advocating extra-marital affairs.*

*We exposed the concepts to a cross section of Australian mums to ensure it was seen as humorous. The media placement was in adult publications specifically targeting mums, certainly not children.*

*The executions did not appear in any Children's publications.*

*It was our intention to engage with mums and provide some light relief. It was certainly not our intention to offend or breach the AANA Code of Conduct.*

*We hope you can see the humour in the manner in which it was intended. Our sincere apologies to those we have offended.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement implies an extra marital sexual relationship and trivialises adultery.

The Board noted the advertiser's response and viewed the advertisement.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: "*Advertising or marketing communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone.*"

The Board noted that the advertisement is for the sale of washing detergent and that it depicts an urban myth. The Board agreed that the child's drawing was intended to be funny, a humorous depiction of the sometimes inappropriate honesty of children, and that most people would understand that the advertisement was not advocating or trivialising adultery.

The Board agreed that the advertisement was not in breach of section 2.3 of the Code. Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.