



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 56/10 |
| 2. Advertiser | Australian Egg Corporation |
| 3. Product | Food & Beverages |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Print |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Wednesday, 10 February 2010 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This ad has a picture of a steak sandwich with an egg. The caption reads "not just fool proof but male proof as well."

THE COMPLAINT

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

The slogan for the ad is clearly sexist. Even though I am aware it could have two meanings, even the milder meaning is still sexist. Either men have no taste or they can't cook. Also it is not clear who the advertiser is. On first reading it actually appears the ad has been posted by the Heart Foundation.

My main complaint, however, is about the sexism. I am sick to death of reverse sexism in Australian advertising. It would in no way be tolerated if women were depicted in this way.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

We note that the complaints relate generally to provision 2.1 of the Code, which provides that: "Advertising and Marketing Communications shall not portray people or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief."

In order to provide some insight into the overall context of the press advertisement we note that the campaign, running since 2008, involves a beautifully shot, delicious egg-based recipe that is talking to people who are not particularly confident in the kitchen. We are trying to get across the message that eggs are "as easy as". As a result, we have tried to use simple language that is very colloquial so that our basic cooks aren't scared off making the dish and enjoying a highly nutritious 'whole food product that is helping address a number of well known social eating disorders.

The headline "Not just fool proof but male proof as well" when in situ in the magazine is clearly a light-hearted comment for the benefit of the readership of the magazines which is predominantly female. We contend that it in no way discriminates or vilifies men. Rather, it is a humorous message about the simplicity of making tasty meals with eggs.

We submit that the advertisement is not in breach of the Code of Ethics in relation to 2.1 or other provisions of the Code.

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 was sexist and reverse sexism.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.1 of the Code.

Section 2.1 of the Code states:

"Advertising or marketing communications shall not portray people or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief."

Some members of the Board felt that the caption in the ad was suggesting that men cannot cook and was patronising. However, the majority of the Board agreed that it was intended to be an affectionate dig in the ribs and not taken offensively. The Board noted that the advertisement was placed in a cooking magazine, with a significant readership of women. The Board considered that the advertisement was depicting a stereotypical characteristic of men (that they cannot cook) but that the depiction was clearly lighthearted and not a serious suggestion that all men cannot cook or that men are unintelligent.

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