



Case Report

1	Case Number	0316/17
2	Advertiser	Campbell's Australia
3	Product	Food and Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	26/07/2017
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement depicts different Tim Tam occasions and intends to convey that a Tim Tam biscuit is even better when shared with friends and loved ones; improving a number of everyday scenarios.

THE COMPLAINT

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

There is one scene where it is a depiction of a late night corporate style business meeting. The entire table was made up of females. One of the participants snuck a pack of tim tams out of her purse, this caused the remaining participants to be depicted as becoming a giggly group with a loss of focus. As a regular participant in the environment depicted I feel that this depiction is at best, flippant, about the seriousness of women in this type of environment. That is at best, truly I think it is well up there on the scale of misogynistic depiction of the value that women are able to bring to the corporate environment.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The scene to which the complaint pertains is set late at night in a corporate boardroom. It is clear that the four women featured are working late due to it being pitch black outside and the rest of the office being dark. It has obviously been a long day and the women have, quite naturally, lost focus. One pulls a pack of Tim Tam biscuits out of her bag and the other women immediately appear re-energised as they humorously 'lunge' towards the biscuits. We feel this is a light-hearted and exaggerated depiction of the 'stir-craziness' that can ensue following a really long day in the office.

You have asked us to address all 6 subsections of Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics, and our response follows. As the advertisement was not directed towards children aged 14 years or younger, we do not consider it relevant to address the Code for Advertising & Marketing Communications to Children.

Section 2.1

This advertisement does not discriminate against or vilify women. The women depicted in this part of the advertisement are clearly portrayed as hardworking professionals who have stayed back late to complete a task or project. We consider this to be a positive portrayal of women. In our view, the mere inclusion of some excitement or delight when a favourite treat loved by millions of Australians is brought out does not make the depiction disparaging of women in any way.

Section 2.2

The advertisement does not contain any sexual references or content. The women depicted share a light-hearted moment when one presents a pack of chocolate biscuits which is a welcome break from a meeting that is going well into the evening.

Section 2.3

The advertisement does not contain any violence.

Section 2.4

The advertisement does not contain any sexual references or nudity.

Section 2.5

The advertisement does not contain any strong or obscene language.

Section 2.6

The advertisement does not depict any unsafe, harmful or dangerous behaviour.

Section 2.7

The content is clearly an advertisement, finishing with the Tim Tam tagline and logo. We believe that viewers understand that after a long day in a corporate environment, a loss of focus can be inevitable. Often a small treat - like a Tim Tam - can reinvigorate the room and provide a much-needed energy boost.

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 depicts women becoming giggly when a packet of Tim Tams is opened during a corporate-style meeting which devalues women's role in the workplace.

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 this television advertisement depicts various scenarios where a packet of Tim Tams is shared between relatives, friends, lovers, and colleagues.

The Board noted the complainant's concern over the scene depicting four women in a boardroom environment becoming giggly when a packet of Tim Tams is produced.

The Board noted the overall tone of the advertisement and considered that each scenario is depicted in a light-hearted manner suggestive of people who are comfortable with one another taking some time to share a snack. The Board noted that the woman who produces the Tim Tam packet in the workplace is initially shown to be hiding its existence from her colleagues, who all look tired and unmotivated, and considered that the manner in which the other three women react is suggestive of them being revitalised by the appearance of the snack. The Board noted that the women all appear comfortable with one another and considered that their reaction is suggestive of a friendly relationship and there is no suggestion that their behaviour is gender specific or that men would not also react in the same way in the same scenario; a colleague producing a chocolate snack, during a boring moment at work, which everyone wants to share.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not devalue the role of women in the workplace or portray or depict any 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.