



## Case Report

1	Case Number	0183/11
2	Advertiser	Supre Pty Ltd
3	Product	Clothing
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	08/06/2011
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

### ISSUES RAISED

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

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advert depicts a woman dancing to jazz style music. She is wearing a pair of jeggings, a white t-shirt tied under her bust and high heels.

The Supre logo is on the screen throughout, and the final text on screen reads, "Get jegged at Supre."

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*Supre's target audience is young to mid teen girls - it's about time industry took some proactive responsibility for the messages they are sending. I would assert as usual that this ad would not contravene any of the current voluntary code of ethics - and would be most surprised if complaints were upheld...but here's a suggestion....It's time to get with the research and concern from the child psychiatric and child psychology world!!!*

*The clothing is aimed at the tween age girls market and has a topless woman wearing the jeggings. I do not see the link between being topless and wearing jeggings. There are many other tops she could wear which would still alert the viewer to the type of clothing being advertised. I believe this ad to be extremely inappropriate for young girls and a completely gratuitous use of the female body to promote the clothing. I ask that it be removed.*

*I have found that this ad is very disgraceful. The ad shows a young women dancing around licking her lips, touching her bottom, rubbing her legs and jumping on a bed. All of which*

*this is very disturbing. The young woman is only in her jeggings and she only has a top on that is very short. This shows girls nowadays that if we don't look like this then we are not perfect. Do you really want girls thinking that about themselves? Please remove this ad from TV.*

*It is an overtly sexualised portrayal of a girl wearing jeggings and sends the wrong message to young girls who may wish to shop in Supre.*

*Teenagers need no encouragement to aspire to look like this model - enough of them already resent the fact that they will probably never look as fantastic in jeggings as that girl.*

*The ad is not shown at a time that I would have thought would be prime time for the age group Supre is generally for - I really do feel the girl in the ad is the main attraction with the pants they are attempting to advertise coming in second.*

*I don't think this type of advertising is required to sell clothing. It gives the wrong message to younger female viewers and is more deemed at the male viewers. It is sexualising the sale of clothing. I find this type of advertising very offensive and am sick of being bombarded with this type of content on television of which you cannot just chose not to watch as it is an add that comes on randomly.*

*I object because it was played during a family program such as Masterchef. I object because it makes sexual connotations which I think are unnecessary in order to sell clothes.*

*I was offended because it sexualises women and makes us objects to be used by men. I am not sure who is meant to be the target!*

*Can you please do something about this? Really! It is society as a whole you are affecting! What do you think when you see a half naked woman!!!!!!*

*My two boys who love watching Neighbours every night are aged 10 and 12 and are so embarrassed and disgusted as soon as the ad comes on they hide their faces or race to turn the TV off. As a mother I am incredibly concerned about the sexualisation of young people by retailers and media. The ad is incredibly sexually suggestive and in the worst taste. I shop at Supre and am appalled that they think this is what their consumers want.*

## **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 complaint we do not feel that the TV commercial it is overly sexualised. The campaign and jeggings are targeted at females 18 - 25 years. SUPRE is considering changing the Rating with CAD to either a GW – General with Warning - or PG.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standard Board ('the Board') considered whether the advertisement complied with the AANA Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board noted the complainants' concerns that this advertisement is aimed at young girls and implies they too should be skinny, focuses on the bottom of the woman in the advertisement, and that it is inappropriately sexualised.

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

The Board first 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, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief.'

The Board noted that the advertisement features a young woman dancing by herself and that she is wearing jeggings, high heels and a t-shirt knotted around her waist.

The Board noted the complainants' concerns that the advertisement focuses on the rear of the woman portrayed. The Board considered that any close ups of the woman in the advertisement are to highlight the features of the jeggings she is wearing and that as an active participant in the advertisement she is not being objectified.

Based on the above the Board determined that, in this instance, the advertisement did not objectify women and did not depict any material that discriminated against or vilified any person or section of society. The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 states: '...shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone'.

The Board noted that complainant concerns that the advertisement is sexualised in particular parts of the advertisement where the woman has her hands on her bottom, running her hand over her thighs and jumping on a bed. The Board also noted that it has considered a poster for this product from the same advertiser and that complaints about the poster were upheld on the basis that they were inappropriately sexualised. The Board noted that while part of the same campaign, the television advertisement must be considered in the context of being viewed on television.

In the Board's view the advertisement predominantly depicts a young woman who is wearing the product advertised. While it is possible to attribute a sexualised context to the advertisement, in the Board's view most people would view the young woman as dancing and enjoying the freedom of movement that the product permits. The Board considered that the depiction of the young woman dancing was fun and lighthearted and was not sexualised.

The Board considered that the depiction of the young woman on a bed was not sexualised and was consistent with a suggestion of a person who has just gotten dressed in their bedroom.

The Board noted the close up of the woman poking her tongue between her teeth and considered that this image was very minor in the overall lighthearted tone of the advertisement.

The Board noted that the accompanying song included the words “little girl” in the lyrics and considered that these words are often used in popular music and that the song is not inappropriate.

The Board noted that the advertisement had a G rating and considered that this was not inappropriate as most people, particularly children, would be unlikely to take any sexual suggestion from the advertisement.

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 2.3 of the Code.

The Board also considered whether the advertisement met section 2.6 of the Code which requires that ‘advertising or marketing communications not depict material contrary to prevailing community standards on health and safety.’

The Board noted complainants concerns that the advertisement depicted a young woman who was inappropriately thin and that this contributes to low self-esteem and inappropriate issues around body image for women and girls. The Board considered that the young woman in the advertisement was slim but that she does not appear inappropriately or unhealthily slim. The Board noted that there is no requirement on advertisers to use a diversity of body shapes and sizes in advertising, however desirable that may be. The Board determined that the advertisement does not depict material that is contrary to prevailing community standards on health and safety.

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