



# Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0142/10</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Charcoal Chicken</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Food and Beverages</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>TV</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>28/04/2010</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Upheld - Modified or Discontinued</b>

## ISSUES RAISED

- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender
- 2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A woman is dressed in a corset, swim suit bottoms with a skirt attached, black stockings and chicken feet. The camera scrolls down the woman's body. Various words appear on the screen to coincide with the part of the woman being shown. Text states 'succulent wings', 'tender breasts', 'juicy thighs', 'nice legs'. As the camera reaches the woman's feet it reveals that the woman is wearing large costume chicken feet. The text concludes with the name and logo for the company 'Charcoal Chicken'.

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*This ad is degrading to women. While I object to the ad and hope that it would be withdrawn from all timeslots I find it particularly offensive that it was played during a daytime timeslot when children may be watching. I find it offensive to compare a woman's body to a piece of meat. Not funny. Not clever. Anyone who does think that making a comparison between a woman and a piece of meat is humourous needs to study up on the history of the women's movement and feminism and needs to understand that the messages that this ad sends is highly offensive sexist and backward.*

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

*We reservedly apologise for any offence or distress caused to any individual by our advertisement aired on Channel 10 Toowoomba, as it was not our intention to be offensive to the wider community.*

*In regards to the actual complaint the description of the advertisement is a little misleading; the woman in question is dressed in a corset, swim suit bottoms with a skirt attached, black stockings and chicken feet. There is no voice over to the advertisement but rather word association on screen relating to the various points of the pan shot. Apart from the shot of the bust area and arms there is no bare flesh shown during the course of the advertisement, nor is any offensive part of the anatomy visible.*

*In relation to Section 2 Clause 2.1 of the AANA Code of Ethics*

*Society is well aware of the female form and certainly does not have any trouble discerning between the female anatomy and that of a hen. The advertisement does not make any direct association of a woman and a chicken and we are sure the viewer does not associate the two until the closing shot.*

*The advertisement is done in good taste and we do not believe that it vilifies the female gender. The advertisement is not portraying or speaking of the gender with revulsion; nor does it seek to defile or make morally vile the female form. I will concede however that it could be perceived as lowering the worth of the female gender and for this I apologise.*

*In relation to Section 2 Clause 2.3 of the AANA Code of Ethics*

*This advertisement complies with this clause showing nothing which should offend the audience of the intended time slots. The material broadcast was rated PG which restricts airing to times when children are least likely to observe the advertisement. The time and day of the complaint is a week day during school hours when children of an age capable of associating the words on screen with the images portrayed should be in school.*

*Should this not be the case and children are present the rating recommends Parental Guidance in relation to the material shown.*

#### *Conclusion*

*We have had a lot of positive response from customers and general public who were actively polled in the early stages of this advertisements airing, specifically for the purpose of gauging peoples reaction to the content of the advertisement. We acknowledge that there will always be members of the public who will take offence to material presented regardless of how sensitively it is handled and we can assure you however we will take to task the points made and work to ensure greater care is taken in the future.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') was required to determine whether the material before it was in breach of the AANA Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement is degrading to women.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement meets the requirements of section 2.1 of the Code: 'shall not portray people or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of ...sex.'

The Board considered that the advertiser has clearly intended to create a humorous advertisement. However in the Board's view the advertisement objectifies women - comparing a woman's anatomy to chicken meat. The Board considered that this comparison and depiction is demeaning to women and that the depiction amounts to discrimination against women. The Board determined that the advertisement depicted material that discriminated against women and that the advertisement breached section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board also considered whether the advertisement complied with section 2.3 of the Code: 'shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant timezone.' The Board considered that the woman, although she is wearing an attractive corset, was not sexualised or overly revealing. The Board noted the PG timing of the advertisement and considered that the advertisement did treat sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and did not breach section 2.3 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement breached the Code the Board upheld the complaint.

#### **ADVERTISER RESPONSE TO DETERMINATION**

The Advertiser advised that the advertisement will be removed from broadcast.