



## Case Report

1	Case Number	0184/17
2	Advertiser	Brierley Hose and Handling
3	Product	House Goods Services
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	10/05/2017
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

### ISSUES RAISED

- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women
- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general
- 2.6 - Health and Safety Within prevailing Community Standards

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement depicts a young female in shorts in a workshop, picking up a piece of hose, walking to various locations within the workshop and performing different tasks with this hose pipe.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*What I want to know is what a young girl in daisy dukes actually has to do with selling hose pipes and fittings. There are a lot of leg shots objectifying this young girl. This is a completely useless ad which does absolutely nothing for their brand!*

*This offensive ad depicts a young woman (approx 18 -20 yrs) wearing very short shorts, walking around the factory floor holding a large hose in her hand - she then places that hose in a machine and pulls the handle down (slowly) .. doesn't sound offensive?! but clearly the message is meant to be interpreted as.... "men come and buy our products and you'll be served by a sexy young chick whom is practiced in holding phallic symbols and giving hand jobs".. the angle of the lens is focused on her backside and groin ... do they want to sell hosing products or offering prostitution services??? I feel embarrassed for the young lady whom*

*most probably doesn't even work there. Please do something about this ad – it's wrong and it's offensive. I will not buy their products based on this advertisement.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*Our advert is aimed at our industrial customer base the girl is attractive and clad in clothes promoting our hydraulic hoses. We see nothing wrong with the advert and would like to continue running it.*

## **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 focuses on a woman wearing shorts which is objectifying and sexualised.

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: (a) where images of Minors, or people who appear to be Minors, are used; or (b) in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people."

The Board noted the AANA Practice Note which provides guidance on the meaning of the terms exploitative and degrading:

"Exploitative - means clearly appearing to purposefully debase or abuse a person, or group of persons, for the enjoyment of others, and lacking moral, artistic or other values.

Degrading – lowering in character or quality a person or group of people."

The Board noted that in order to breach this Section of the Code the images would need to be using sexual appeal in a manner that is considered both exploitative and degrading.

The Board noted the advertisement features a woman wearing shorts and a top demonstrating the services they provide for hoses.

The Board noted it had previously dismissed complaints about the same advertisement when it was aired just over five years ago (0065/12) where:

"A minority of the Board considered that the combination of the woman's shorts and the close up scenes of her carrying the hose meant that attention was drawn to her legs and bottom and that it was not relevant to the product advertised for her to be dressed in such a manner. The majority of the Board however considered that the woman is undertaking work related tasks and that she is not presented in a sexualised manner. The Board determined that

the advertisement did not objectify women in a manner which would amount to discrimination.”

The Board noted the woman’s clothing and considered that while denim shorts and a t-shirt are not inappropriate clothing for the type of work the woman is performing the Board considered that the focus on the woman’s legs as she walks away from the camera is voyeuristic and could be seen as exploitative.

The Board noted however that the woman is operating machinery and demonstrating the services offered by the advertiser and considered that the depiction of this woman as a capable member of the workforce is positive rather than degrading.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of this, or any other, woman.

The Board determined that it 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 complainants’ concerns that the woman’s shorts are ‘very, very short’ and that she is depicted in a manner which is sexy.

The Board noted that the woman in the advertisement is wearing denim shorts and considered that they are tailored shorts rather than cut-off shorts and their length is not inappropriate and the woman’s bottom is adequately and appropriately covered. The Board noted the woman’s actions in using machinery to prepare a length of hose and considered that her behaviour is not sexualised and she is depicted as a capable member of a workplace and not in a manner which is sexy or inappropriate for the environment.

The Board noted the complainant’s concern that the hose in the advertisement is a phallic symbol and considered that in the context of the advertiser’s business – hose and handling – the depiction of a hose is clearly not intended to be anything other than a hose and in the Board’s view the complainant’s interpretation is unlikely to be shared broad community.

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

The Board then considered Section 2.6 of the Code. Section 2.6 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety”.

The Board noted that the woman in the advertisement is operating machinery and that her long hair is not tied back. The Board noted that the woman is operating machinery with confidence and considered that although she does not appear to be in any danger the Board expressed concern over the possible health and safety implications of long hair being caught in machinery. The Board acknowledged that the depiction of the woman in the advertisement was not a clear breach of Prevailing Community Standards but considered that advertisers

should take care when depicting the operation of machinery to ensure that the highest level of workplace health and safety practices are depicted and encouraged.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards and determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.6 of the Code.

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