



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	300/05
2. Advertiser	Unilever Australasia (Dove Firming - Curvy Girls)
3. Product	Toiletries
4. Type of advertisement	Transport
5. Nature of complaint	Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 11 October 2005
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This outdoor print advertisement features a studio photograph of six women in their underwear. The women photographed are likely to wear clothing sizes 12 to 16. The words: “*Let’s face it. Firming the thighs of a size 8 super model is no challenge*” appear above the photograph of the women. Smaller images of the products being advertised appear to the right of the photograph. The words “*Real women have real curves. To celebrate those curves we asked real women to try our new Dove firming range. Here are the results*” also appear to the right of the image.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“The entire outside of the tram has pictures of young women in their underwear standing and sitting in compromising positions. Very offensive.”

“It is immodest and sexual.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“... The creative is not intended to cause offence, but rather to recognise and celebrate the fact that women come in all shapes and sizes... This current advertising celebrates real women with real bodies and real curves in a tasteful, liberating 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 noted that the image in the advertisement did not portray any nudity and that the image was not overly graphic in that it did not expose the breasts or genitals in any way. The Board considered that the positions of the models as presented were not immodest or overly sexual.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality or nudity.

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