



ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BUREAU

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph (02) 6173 1500 | Fax (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1	Case Number	0122/14
2	Advertiser	Horticulture Australia Limited
3	Product	Food and Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	23/04/2014
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender
- 2.3 - Violence Violence

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A voice over says that when it comes to energy snacks there are n-nos and there are na-nas and we see people eating bananas in various settings.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Most of the ad is fine, but there is a close up of a woman's bottom as she walks while holding a bunch of bananas. This shot stands out as offensive and incredibly sexist. The rest of the ad is funny, fun and has a great atmosphere whilst this shot jars and is completely unnecessary and adds to the stream of ads where women's bodies are used to sell products.

I feel strongly that as a society we are trying our best and even have advertisements to stop people "king hitting" or now more appropriately called a cowards punch, inciting young men in particular to continue these random acts of violence (against fellow human beings.)

Thus I am deeply offended, shocked and annoyed that an advertisement aimed at children (and adult purchasers too) where a disproportionate red boxing glove is used to punch someone in the head, claiming that there is "no bone" in their bananas, as breaching your Code. Regardless of the fact that it is a silly ad as there are no bones in bananas.

I am not complaining about the inference of there being 'no bone' as I doubt young people

would know that saying. However, there is also this underlying veiled sexual reference linked to the abuse/violence.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The commercial dramatises in a larger-than-life, intentionally comical way the results of consuming a series of unhealthy products. In the commercial we see one man launch into space like a rocket, another appears in a rapidly spinning vortex and a third man is whacked by a larger than life over-sized boxing glove.

In the context of the advertisement, the boxing glove and the punch it delivers are clearly not true-to-life and are purely used to communicate the fact that sugary snacks (like the donut the man is eating) only deliver a "quick hit" of energy.

The cartoon-style glove is two feet tall and hits the man on the side of his body (not his head as stated in the complaint). With reference to Section 2.2 of the A.A.N.A. Code of Ethics, we feel this does not constitute a depiction of serious violence and is justifiable in the context of the message it is delivering for Australian Bananas.

The second allegation in the complaint of a "veiled sexual reference" makes no sense whatsoever. The commercial does not use the term "no bone" and we presume the complainant mis-heard the actual words: "Quick hit is a no-no. Lasting energy is a na-na."

Finally, we thought it worth noting that this television commercial was recognised by the Australian Parent's Jury organisation in its annual Fame and Shame Awards. The commercial won the Parent's Choice Award in 2012 for the best Australian advertisement promoting healthy eating to children in a fun and appealing 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 the complainants' concerns that the advertisement depicts a close-up image of a woman's bottom and a man being punched by a giant boxing glove in a depiction of violence.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.1 of the Code which requires that 'advertisements shall not portray or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual preference, religion, disability, mental illness or political belief.'

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the scene featuring a woman holding a bunch of bananas focuses on her bottom in a manner which is sexist.

The Board noted that this scene shows a woman wearing bikini bottoms and considered that this is not inappropriate in the context of a woman in a pool side setting. The Board noted that this scene is very brief and considered that the focus is more on the bananas she is holding which are then shared out amongst a group of men and women all wearing swim wear.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not depict material which discriminates against or vilifies a section of the community on account of gender.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not present or portray violence unless it is justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised".

The Board noted the complainant's concerns that the scene where a man is hit from the side by a giant boxing glove is a depiction of violence that is not appropriate.

The Board noted that it had recently dismissed a similar complaint in case 0102/14:

"The Board noted the complainant's concerns about 'king hits' but considered there was no relation between actual violence such as a king hit and the slapstick exchange between the circus characters in the advertisement."

The Board noted that in the current advertisement the overall tone is also slapstick and considered that the use of the boxing glove was to emphasise the 'sugar hit' gained from eating a donut rather than a depiction of actual violence. The Board noted the complainant's concerns that there was a 'veiled sexual reference linked to the abuse/violence' in the advertisement and considered that this was an unlikely interpretation of the advertisement.

The Board noted that the advertisement had been rated 'C' by CAD which means it can be broadcast at any time except during pre-school programs. The Board considered that the content of the advertisement was consistent with the relevant audience which would include children.

Based on the above the Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.3 of

the Code.

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