



## Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0203/10</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Kraft Foods Ltd</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>12/05/2010</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

### ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The Philadelphia Cream for Cooking television commercial features a woman describing the new Philadelphia product, as two men are cooking in the background. The woman exits the kitchen arm in arm with the male cooks in their underwear. She smacks one on the backside with end caption: "Less Fat, Less naughty, Heavenly" and an image of tub of Philadelphia Cream with angel wings.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*I object because the advertisement objectifies the two men including at the end when the woman sexually assaults one of the men by smacking on the buttocks. If something similar had been done with a couple of women it would never have seen the light of the day in our society of 'equality' advertisers have no right to treat men as a sex object or to belittle them in such a manner.*

*If the two genders were reversed and it was a male slapping a females bum it would make the 6 o'clock news!*

*I think the ad encourages sexual abuse and is highly inappropriate especially as it is shown throughout the time slots kids watch TV.*

*It offends me to think that it is now OK to slap the behind of someone working for you in an ad.*

*I feel that the ad is objectifying men and believe that if the genders were reversed it would be considered sexist by a majority of female viewers. As such I believe it is rational for a male to find it sexist the double standard of which offends me.*

- The male chefs are visualized in an implied sexual object manner.
- Female presenter slaps one chef on the backside as they are walking away arms linked.
- If this was reversed (sexually - female for male and vice versa) there would be an outcry.

While this advertisement is presumably designed to appeal to women it succeeds in insulting women. The ad is based on the gratuitous promotion of inappropriate sexual stereotypes. At a time when there are serious objections to the sexual objectification of women being used to sell everything from office equipment to motorcycles it is completely unacceptable to permit tv advertisements which are based entirely on the sexual objectification of men and women's presumed interest in this. This advertisement succeeds in demeaning to both men and women and should be removed from television.

When considering this advertisement I would urge you to imagine the roles being reversed: ask yourself whether the ad would be considered acceptable if a man were in the female's role and if women took the places of the male cooks. I believe that such an ad would result in a public outcry - as this one should.

Complete objectification of men who women can treat any way they want. The ad sure would draw a lot of flak if the roles were reversed.

If it were a man slapping a woman on her backside instead of the reverse there would probably be a lot more complaints about this ad. Why is it ok to portray men like this? The man is scantily clad adding to the sexual aspect of the image with the caption ""less naughty"". The image is demeaning in implying the woman is treating the man as a sexual plaything. Its not even a clever ad as has been the case with other Philly Cheese ads. Its cringeworthy. In an era where we are trying to teach people including kids that sexual harassment is not ok this sort of ad should not be shown on t.v.

I am very offended by the objectification of the men in this advertisement. I feel that this is unacceptable discrimination in the form of sexism towards men. I am confident that the advertiser is aware that such material with gender roles reversed would be unpalatable to their target audience; and as such is discriminatory.

I appreciate that the ad is not to be taken too seriously and that it is a take on out dated gender roles. However I strongly feel that any depiction of either men or women in a derogatory way demeans us all. And a woman spanking a man on the bottom is every bit as offensive as a man doing the same to a woman especially when there is sexual undertones involved. I really believed we had moved away from this form of sexist advertising. This is clearly sex discrimination and degrading to men.

I am outraged that this type of advertising keeps coming up on TV

If it were the other way around with a female getting smacked on the backside there would be an outcry.

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*Further to the complaints received regarding Philadelphia Cream for Cooking's new television commercial, we would like to provide the following defence in relation to the advertisement's meaning, content and key messages.*

*Kraft Foods maintains an industry lead position on the content of its advertising campaigns and adheres to strict policies that support gender equality. Kraft Foods does not support discrimination of any kind including gender, race or creed.*

*In brief our interpretation and intent of the television commercial is as follows:*

*The commercial is positioned from the viewpoint that rich, indulgent, creamy foods have always been perceived as “naughty”, because of cream’s notorious high fat reputation.*

*As the new Philadelphia Cream for Cooking product is so low in fat (up to 60 per cent less fat than regular cream), we can state that it is less naughty than regular cream. However, we understand that there are times when it is fun to be naughty. Hence the message in the television commercial is about not having to give up naughtiness.*

*The protagonist in the commercial is simply seeking other ways of being cheeky and naughty, because Philadelphia Cream for Cooking has taken the naughtiness out of cream.*

*The act of tapping the male model’s behind as the commercial closes is simply a playful way of demonstrating the naughty fix that the protagonist is seeking. Under no circumstances is the tapping meant to be demeaning, objectifying, or offensive towards either gender, but rather mild flirtation. Its intent is to elicit a cheeky smile or giggle from its audience, rather than encouraging the objectification of men.*

*Conscious of the need to ensure that reasonable standards were not offended, we had both the script for this commercial, and the final offline edit, reviewed before proceeding. Upon sending the final offline edit to CAD for formal approval and rating, we were advised that the commercial was rated ‘G’.*

*The execution was also tested with 150 female consumers aged 25 to 55 years. Most respondents agreed that the advertisement created an overall tone of ‘sexy’ (65%) & ‘fun’ (54%), followed by ‘modern’ (36%) & ‘funny’ (34%).*

*Under no circumstances do we believe that the Philadelphia Cream for Cooking television commercial contravenes the Advertiser Code of Ethics.*

## **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 portrays unacceptable behavior, depicts the objectification of men and depicts women in a demeaning manner.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s response. The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.1 of the Code. Section 2.1 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications 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 race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief”.

The Board considered that the intention of the advertisement was to present the product as being a good health choice which enables you to be a bit 'naughty' in other areas. In the Board's view the advertisement is a parody of advertisements that use attractive women to present products - the parody element is clearly shown by the women redirecting the viewer's

attention to the product not to the men cooking and the depiction of the men wearing only underwear as they walk away - a clear reference to the use of scantily clad women in advertising. The Board considered that the depiction of the woman patting one of the men on the bottom is a continuation of the parody. The Board considered that the tone of the advertisement is light hearted and flirty and that the men happily go along with the woman's references to them being good looking. The Board considered that the advertisement is not demeaning to men and does not discriminate against or vilify men.

The Board also considered the depiction of the woman patting the man on the bottom and noted complainant's concerns that the advertisement is demeaning to women. The Board considered that the parody and humour in the advertisement provided a context for the woman's behaviour and does not suggest that such actions are attributable to all women. The Board considered that the advertisement does not discriminate against or vilify women. The Board determined that the advertisement does not breach section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board noted complainant concerns that the advertisement depicts unacceptable behaviour. The Board considered that the context of the parody presented the behaviour as a one off and does not suggest that this type of behaviour is appropriate for all situations. The Board noted that sexual harassment is a serious social issue, however considered that this advertisement is not condoning inappropriate behaviour in the workplace.

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