



ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

Case Number 0299/17 1 2 Advertiser **Belly Bandit Australia** 3 **Product Clothing** 4 **Type of Advertisement / media** Internet 5 **Date of Determination** 12/07/2017 **DETERMINATION Dismissed**

ISSUES RAISED

2.5 - Language Inappropriate language

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This online advertisement for Mother Tucker shape wear appears on the Toys R Us website and features images of women modeling the range along with pricing information.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I am sure kids have seen advertising for women's underwear before as it is ubiquitous however the crass word play to conjure the words "Mother F_cker" is inappropriate and really quite appalling.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Toys R US on-line store. Only found via search bar if a consumer types in brand name will they find this product. Not an advertisement, rather a sore product listing only. The product appears as an image of the product together with a very small product description and a price.

The Mother Tucker shape wear line is part of the Belly Bandit collection of products for before, during and after pregnancy. The name "Mother Tucker" refers to the product's intended audience and purpose, ie 'Mothers" (in particular postpartum women) who want a product to help "tuck" away the lumps and bumps associated with the postpartum period. Mother Tucker shape wear has been sold worldwide since 2011 and has never been the subject of an official complaint regarding its descriptive and tongue-in-cheek name.

The Mother Tucker range is specifically a compression garment range. Designed to provide postpartum mothers with a garment developed to be tight fitting in order to be able to Tuck away bumps and bulges caused by mothers being pregnant for 9 months. These are SUPPORT garnets designed to provide comfort and confidence to postpartum mothers.

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 features a crass play on words which is not appropriate for a children's toys website.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.5 of the Code. Section 2.5 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall only use language which is appropriate in the circumstances (including appropriate for the relevant audience and medium). Strong or obscene language shall be avoided".

The Board noted that this internet advertisement is for a product named 'Mother Tucker' and features images of the product along with the name.

The Board noted that it has no jurisdiction over the name of a product, only how that product is marketed, and considered that while 'Mother Tucker' does rhyme with 'Mother Fucker', as pointed out by the complainant, in the Board's view the use of the product name 'Mother Tucker' next to images of the women's underwear it relates to is not inappropriate. The Board noted that the advertisement does not feature any suggestions that the 'F' word is being alluded to and considered that the phrase 'Mother Tucker' is not of itself strong or obscene language and its use in an advertisement as the name of a product is not inappropriate.

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement features on the Toys R Us website and considered that whilst the toys themselves would be appealing to children in the Board's view the website is directed at adults who purchase the toys, and even if children were to access the website it is unlikely they would be browsing the women's underwear section. The Board considered however that even if children were to view the advertisement, the use of 'Mother Tucker' as the name of a product is not inappropriate for children to view as it does not amount to strong, obscene or inappropriate language.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not use strong, obscene or inappropriate

language and determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.5 of the Code.

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