

COMPLAINT NUMBER	18/305
COMPLAINANT	S Rowland
ADVERTISER	Brand Developers Ltd
ADVERTISEMENT	Air Roaster, Television
DATE OF MEETING	17 September 2018
OUTCOME	No Grounds to Proceed

Advertisement: The Brand Developers television advertisement for the Taste the Difference Air Roaster demonstrates the benefits of the air roasting cooking method and shows an image of a woman eating while the voiceover says in part... “Excess fats and oils can cause you to become overweight, putting your health at risk...”

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

Complainant, S Rowland, said: Air Roaster Advert - Fat Shaming.

Disgusted TVNZ hasn't given more thought in allowing the Air Roaster ad to be aired let alone at dinner time on prime slot. Fat shaming is not ok and has evidence showing it to cause more harm than good, triggering genetic-based eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa.

There is no evidence to support their claims of fat reduction being beneficial in diets when part of a mixed normal diet. In fact the reverse is being discovered to be the case.

Children are 25 times more likely to develop an eating disorder than type 2 diabetes.

Airing this advert is irresponsible and highly triggering, particularly at a meal time when someone with an eating disorder is already struggling. Please consider removing ads like this from slots around meal times.

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

The Chair noted the Complainant's concern the advertisement was employing negative body images to promote its Air Roaster product which could trigger eating disorders.

The Chair said the advertisement was promoting a legal product and demonstrates how the air roasting cooking method can provide a lower calorific cooking option to the use of fats or oils. The Chair said the image of the woman eating in the advertisement with the words “Health Risk” stamped across the screen was not ideal.

Whilst the Chair acknowledged the Complainant's genuine concerns about the risks associated with eating disorders, she said it would be a reach to say the advertisement promoting an alternative cooking method was therefore irresponsible.

The Chair said the advertisement was unlikely to cause serious or widespread offence and had not reached the threshold to breach Basic Principle 4 or Rule 4 of the Code of Ethics.

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

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

APPEAL INFORMATION

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website www.asa.co.nz. Appeals must be made in writing via email or letter within 14 days of receipt of this decision.