



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 441/07  |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Trend Micro Australia (PC-cillin)   |
| 3. Product                    | Information Technology  |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | Print   |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1<br>Discrimination or vilification Age - Section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Wednesday, 16 January 2008  |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed   |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This print advertisement for the product "peace for parents.com.au" features the photo of an old man, which is resting on a computer keyboard next to an ashtray. Text reads "It's every parent's nightmare. The lurking fear that their children visit websites or chat rooms where predators wait in prey. You can protect your kids 24/7 with Trend Micro's PC-cillin. It incorporates commercial-grade protection from viruses, spyware and internet fraud, safeguards your wireless home network from unauthorised users, offers advanced parental controls and blocks bad stuff at the source, before it even has a chance to get near you or your PC, thanks to unique Web Threat protection. Peace of mind is called Trend Micro PC-cillin. Nothing touches it."

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*The ad has a picture of a middle/older male inferring that this is the typical computer predator. This is discrimination.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*With regard to the complaint that you forwarded to me, this ad was part of a "villians" series of advertisements that we ran near the end of last year that was intended to raise awareness of various online security and safety issues - including the risk of computer viruses, credit card fraud, identity theft and exposure of children to undesirable online content. This last category was intended to build on the awareness generated by the recent Federal government advertising on this topic.*

*The faces chosen for the advertising were by no means intended to discriminate or vilify any section of the community. There was no implication that any specific community group might be a typical online predator. Quite the opposite, in fact, since the choice of images were intended to challenge the perception of online risks being caused by the stereotypical computer "hacker" by presenting faces of a variety of ages and appearance.*

*As an additional note, this series of ads concluded in December of last year and no further placements will be booked.*

## **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 vilified middle aged and older men by including a picture of one such man as an example of an internet predator.

The Board noted that the advertisement is for a software product that assists parents to protect their children from harmful content or websites. Part of this protection is protecting children from internet predators. The inclusion of a picture of a middle aged man or of any person of any particular gender or race, does not of itself suggest that all predators are the same as the person depicted. There is nothing in the advertisement that suggests or infers that all internet predators are the same as the person depicted.

On this basis the Board determined that the advertisement does not depict material that is discriminatory against or vilifying of middle aged or older men and does not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

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