



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	79/06
2. Advertiser	Unilever Australasia (Lipton Iced Green Tea - day spa)
3. Product	Food & Beverages
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Other - Portrayal of people (occupation)
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 March 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement is set in a stylish slightly new-age day spa where the beautician offers a female client a cup of Lipton Iced green tea. The client comments that she has heard the tea is really good for you to which the beautician replies “Just as well...it makes up for the fact that none of our treatments have any actual therapeutic benefit.” The beautician, stirring a pot of mud then asks the question “So, are you looking forward to forking out \$150 for me to slop mud all over you?” and the client replies that the treatment is “so fabulously exclusive”. The beautician confides “Yes... exclusively from our very own backyard.” The client then notices a dirty male gardener shovelling mud into a large container.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Their other ad with the beauty therapist I'm sure also offends people in this industry.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The advertisements were devised to contrast (a) genuine “change for the better” with some fictional lifestyle choices which may not have genuine benefits, and which may even involve pain, great expense, or perhaps even humiliating rituals.

...the benefits of these practices were considered to be a little doubtful to many consumers.

...the characters say exactly what is in their mind in various commonly experienced awkward situations – in other words, showing people behaving with “refreshing” honesty in a humorous way.

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 that this advertisement make light heartened fun of people who spend a lot of money on beauty treatments and of beauty treatments per se.

The Board considered that Australia ’s society does tolerate light hearted humour of the beliefs and behaviour of many people and of the things on which people choose to spend money.

The Board did not consider that the comments made in the advertisement amounted to vilification of any person's occupation or lifestyle choices and did not breach clause 2.1 of the Code.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.