



Case Report

1	Case Number	0214/16
2	Advertiser	Sportsbet
3	Product	Gaming
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	25/05/2016
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The television advertisement depicts a man shopping in a fictional supermarket designed to appeal exclusively to 'blokes'. Everything in the supermarket is arranged for the convenience of the man, including a 'Saturday Arvo Barbie' aisle, a 'Tools You'll Only Use Once' aisle and a 'Bacon and Bacon-related items' aisle. The voiceover likens the ease and convenience associated with the supermarket to Sportsbet's new Multi Builder product, where a multi bet can be placed without having to change screens.

THE COMPLAINT

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

The advertisement is sexist. "Men, imagine there was a supermarket for blokes." Surely supermarkets are for all people not just the underlying assumption they are for females. This ad perpetuates gender stereotypes and the notion that females are the people who should do the grocery shopping while the men go out and have fun and bet!

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The Advertisement does not state or suggest in any way that 'females are the people who should do the grocery shopping' or that 'that [supermarkets] are for females'. Women are not mentioned or referenced in any way in the Advertisement, least of all with any discriminatory or vilifying implication. By selecting those items that appeal to the stereotypical 'bloke' and presenting them in the one, convenient location, this cannot reasonably be viewed as discriminating against, or vilifying women. Sportsbet believes that the Complaint lacks foundation and should be dismissed.

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 is sexist and perpetuates gender stereotypes in relation to women.

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 that the advertisement takes place in a fictional 'supermarket for blokes'. The Board considered that the advertisement uses obvious humour in its depiction of the supermarket and plays on what is clearly an exaggerated male stereotype.

The Board noted the AANA Practice Note and specifically considered the references to:

'Advertisements can suggest stereotypical aspects of... gender with humour provided the overall impression of the advertisement is not a negative impression of people of that...gender'.

The Board considered that the overall tone of the advertisement was humorous and there was no negative impression presented by the presentation of the male in such an obviously light hearted and exaggerated way.

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement perpetuates the notion that females are the people who do the grocery shopping. The Board considered that presenting the male in the supermarket in this manner does not suggest that women are usually the main grocery buyers.

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

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

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