



Case Report

1	Case Number	0292/12
2	Advertiser	The Stag Hotel
3	Product	Food and Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Internet
5	Date of Determination	25/07/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Ad is promoting Bulmers Cider by the Jug and has an image of two females from the back. Likened to Adam and Eve, Eve with the Apple!

THE COMPLAINT

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

'Enough to Share' uses the images of two naked women to sell the cider with vulgar references to the women in the ad's phrasing. These advertisements sexually exploit and degrade women in order to sell the hotel's food which I find offensive.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The Stag has a database and membership of 15,000 with approx 900 people through on a Saturday aged between 18-25yrs old.

*No one has ever complained about this within the venue.
I saw far mpore explicit and suggest Utbue trailers on Channel 9 this morning 12/7/12. This is on our web site and you really have to go looking for it.
Instead of ""unknown"" complained to you couldn't they say something to us?
If someone doesn't like their steak do they go to The Meat Industry Council? No they talk to us.*

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 sexually exploits women.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.2 of the Code which states, “Advertising or Marketing Communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people.”

The Board noted the advertisement featured an image of two topless women with their backs to the camera alongside a jug and glass of Bulmers cider and that the text reads, “Enough to share!”

The Board noted the confident poses of the women and considered they were not represented in a manner which could be considered exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading and did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience”.

The Board considered that the use of this image on the advertiser’s website meant it would be available to a limited audience which would be unlikely to include children.

The Board noted that whilst the women in the advertisement appear to be naked, only their backs are visible and not their chests. The Board noted that whilst it is not necessary for the women to be naked, the Board considered that the level of nudity depicted is not inappropriate and the advertisement does treat nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Board noted the advertisement features the phrase “Enough to share”. The Board noted that this phrase could be interpreted to mean that the woman depicted are to be shared, however the Board considered that in this instance the phrase is used in the context of jug of Bulmers and that most members of the community would consider this mild innuendo to be not inappropriate.

The Board determined that the advertisement was not sexualised, did not contain inappropriate sexual material, did not contain inappropriate nudity and did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

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