

|                         |                        |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b> | 17/366                 |
| <b>COMPLAINANT</b>      | M. Lynch               |
| <b>ADVERTISER</b>       | Seqirus (NZ) Ltd       |
| <b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>    | Seqirus (NZ) Ltd Radio |
| <b>DATE OF MEETING</b>  | 9 October 2017         |
| <b>OUTCOME</b>          | No Grounds to Proceed  |

**Advertisement:** The radio advertisement for HPV Immunisation uses a male ‘teacher’ with a nasal voice to make good news and bad news announcements. The advertisement is highlighting that teenage boys can get HPV cancer and a prescription medicine vaccine is available. He says “the good news is you can immunize against the virus that causes HPV cancer, the ‘bad news’ is you are teenage boys”.

**The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.**

**Complainant, M. Lynch, said:** The HPV immunisation for boys advert made the comment (or very similar) "The bad news is you're a teenage boy".

I do not see why this comment needed to be made and the meaning behind it. The context of the advert was to present it in a humorous manner but the comment was un-necessary and negative. Why is being a teenage boy bad news?

In light of the low self esteem teenagers already have in general this could be re-enforcing the idea. Certainly this comment would be unacceptable if directed towards teenage girls.

**The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4 and Rule 4**

**The Chair** noted the Complainant’s concerns about the negative reference to teenage boys in the advertisement. The Chair accepted there was an attempt to make the reference humorous but agreed with the Complainant that the advertisement was poorly worded.

The Chair then took into account the advertisement was promoting a vaccine option for HPV cancer and attempting to raise awareness this could be an issue for teenage boys as well as girls.

On balance, taking into account context, medium, audience and product, the Chair said the advertisement did not meet the threshold to clearly offend against generally prevailing community standards.

The Chair said the advertisement was not in breach of Rule 4 of the Code of Ethics and had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility required by Basic Principle 4.

Accordingly, the Chair ruled that there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

**Chair’s Ruling:** Complaint **No Grounds to Proceed**