



CASE REPORT

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 74/02 |
| 2. Advertiser | Unilever Australia (Sunsilk) |
| 3. Product | Toiletries |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 12 March 2002 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement opens on a scene in a trendy hotel lobby where a woman appears to have her thoughts about another woman's hair read by a nearby man who is revealed to be star hairdresser John Bailey. After discussing hair and Sunsilk Maximum Shine with the hairdresser, the woman is indicated to think to herself: "Hmm, I like the look of him. Wonder if he's..." at which point he interrupts, saying "Yea, sorry I am." The screen is filled with a close-up of Sunsilk Maximum Shine products in a hotel bathroom, with a superimposed caption reading: "Try a Little SunSilk Expertise".

THE COMPLAINT

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

"While adults often joke about the gender preference of hairdressers, I do not think that the advertisement is at all suitable to be shown in the middle of a G rated movie that young children will be watching."

"I see no reason for the line ... We are expected to be too tolerant of this lifestyle and our children shouldn't have it pushed in front of them."

"...inappropriate placement of advertising...Really quite unacceptable."

THE DETERMINATION

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

Noting voluntary action by the advertiser to modify the material to remove complainants' cause for offence, the Board determined that, while acknowledging the concerns expressed by complainants, the advertisement as reviewed did not contravene the Code in relation to the portrayal of sex, sexuality and/or nudity.

The Board further determined that the content of the advertisement did not constitute discrimination and/or vilification as represented in the Code, and that it did not breach the Code on any other grounds.

Accordingly, the complaint was dismissed.