



**ADVERTISING  
STANDARDS  
BUREAU**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612  
Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833  
[www.adstandards.com.au](http://www.adstandards.com.au)

## Case Report

1	Case Number	0513/11
2	Advertiser	Windsor Smith Pty Ltd
3	Product	Clothing
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Transport
5	Date of Determination	18/01/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

### ISSUES RAISED

- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - sexualization of children
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - children

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement shows a young woman putting on red lipstick and getting ready to go out. She is wearing a bra and long skirt. The ad features four shoes along with the Lipstik logo, website info, shoe style names and colours and price. The background of the ad is bright yellow.

### THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*The girl in the advert looks underage (13- 16 years of age) and is wearing a black-skirt and bra posing provocatively. I question why they need to objectify and sexualise young girls to sell shoes. Why should I have to be exposed to this on my way into work. Or in turn explain it to the young woman in my life.*

### THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

*This is the 5th advertisement in a successful 12 month campaign. Our Lipstik girl as she is known is a character of the 1950s/glamour era. She is a fun character who in this shot is getting ready to go out and hence wears the Lipstik brand. She is in a bra and a long skirt that is cut off in this ad but in no way is she depicted in a sexual way. I find it offensive that someone has these thoughts when looking at this ad. The model, Anja from Pricillas modelling agency in Sydney, is 21 years old and we have not made any attempt to make her look underage, as our core customer is 18-25 years old.*

## **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 the complainant’s concerns that the advertisement features an underage girl in a provocative pose which is objectifying.

The Board reviewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.2 of the Code which states, “Advertising or Marketing Communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people.”

The Board noted the advertisement features a young woman wearing a bra and skirt applying red lipstick. The Board noted the confident pose of the woman and considered she is not represented in a manner which could be considered exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading and did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.”

The Board noted the complainant’s concern that the model in the advertisement looks to be aged between 13 and 16 years old. The Board considered that the model looks over 18 years old and that most members of the community would agree that the model is not underage.

The Board noted that the model is wearing a bra and skirt and considered that the pose of the model is not sexualised and that the focus on her applying lipstick is in keeping with the name of the product.

The Board noted that the posters are visible to a broad audience that includes children and considered that the advertisement is not inappropriate for a broad audience.

Based on the above the Board considered that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.