



Case Report

1	Case Number	0074/12
2	Advertiser	EMAP Australia Pty Ltd
3	Product	Media
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	14/03/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement opens with a very busty young woman serving an enormous kebab to two young men from a kebab van. One of the men is wearing a white tshirt with Zoo written in large red letters across his chest.

A male voice over then describes the latest edition of Zoo magazine and how it is currently available for less than two dollars and we see some of the editorial features as well as the front cover which features a scantily clad woman posing.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I am disgusted (to say the least!) at the growing amount of pornography shown publicly. There is no regard for people who do not want to view such sexual rubbish. It's right on our screens and billboards in front of us. Eye pollution. The Zoo magazine commercial is an example of this. A woman dressed in a very scanty bikini in a very sexually suggestive pose. This image is demoralising and disrespectful of women. I want it off our TV screens A.S.A.P. Thank you for hearing my complaint to help keep advertising safe and free from degrading material.

This ad showed at 18:30 on a Saturday night on Channel 9 just before Australia's Funniest Home Video Show. The video show is a family show and many children including mine were

watching. Showing the ad at this time encourages the porn industry to become normalised and part of family life. I believe the porn industry should not be a part of family life and we should not be subject to viewing it at an early time slot.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

In response to the complaints received for the Zoo Weekly TVC and regarding Section 2 of the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics, please see our response below:

Zoo Weekly is Australia's most successful men's magazine, now selling over 70,000 copies each week.

Sport, news, girls and gags are topics our target market seek out and are the cornerstones of our editorial direction.

Our core audience recognise amusing moments in life and react in certain ways. We've tried to capture this through our latest TV advertisements with Zoo man recognising these moments and remarking, "That's Zoo." We take steps to ensure that all parts of the advertisement including content and the magazine pages that appear are suitable for the rating we are granted. These are included in our liaisons with Commercials Advice Pty Ltd (CAD).

All possible steps were made to ensure the advertisement complied with Commercial Television Industry Code of Practice and of the two executions, the kebab execution was classified with a 'PG' rating' whilst the Tennis execution was classified with a 'MA' rating. We ensure both ads only appear in the appropriate timeslots for the target market. We can assure you that the Tennis execution is only broadcast after the 8:30pm guidelines and does not run in any G or PG rated programs. Also included in the process, were ongoing liaison with CAD at concept, script and edit stages.

In regards to section 2.4, "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience" and section 2.2, "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 advertising agency engaged with CAD at the script, pre-production & post-production stages, where direction was taken on the visuals and audio to ensure the advertisement was suitable for the relevant viewing times and adhered to all aspects of the AANA Code of Ethics.

? The advertisement does not portray any persons in an inappropriate manner, and there is absolutely no nudity in this advertisement.

We hope that this adds clarification about the intent of the Zoo Weekly advertisement and provides the required background information, please do not hesitate to contact me should you need anything further. I would like to reiterate that every step was taken to ensure this advertisement complied with all required regulations.

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 was screened during programs which have a strong family orientation and features images of women in sexually suggestive poses wearing little clothing.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code 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 complainant’s concerns that women are portrayed in the advertisement in a manner which is disrespectful. The Board noted that the woman in the kebab van and the women appearing in the magazine articles all appear to be confident and empowered and considered that most members of the community would consider the portrayal of women in this manner to not be disrespectful. The Board considered that whilst sexual appeal is used in the advertisement it is used in a manner which would not be considered exploitative and degrading by most members of the community.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading and that the advertisement 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 advertiser’s response that they have taken steps to ensure that all parts of the advertisement including content and the magazine pages that appear are suitable for the rating; in this instance PG for the advertisement featuring a kebab, and MA for the advertisement featuring tennis.

The Board noted that in this instance the advertisement referred to is the ‘kebab’ version and that it has only appeared in the relevant time zone for its classification. The Board noted that the advertised product is a magazine with a male readership and is also classified as a category that is able to be advertised in general media.

The Board considered that the image of the woman’s breasts in the van in the opening part of the PG rated advertisement was not offensive. The Board considered that there was no sexual connotation in this part of the advertisement, with the men exhibiting lust towards the kebab – not the woman.

The Board noted that the other images in the advertisement depicted women in underwear and considered that most people would find the images mildly sexual but relevant to the product and not inappropriate for the relevant PG audience and time zone.

The Board determined that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it 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.