



Case Report

1	Case Number	0345/12
2	Advertiser	Parfums Christian Dior
3	Product	Toiletries
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	12/09/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

We see the model Daphne Groeneveld on the beach and walking through the streets of Saint Tropez, and then dancing in a bar. She is in good spirits throughout and looks somewhat reminiscent of the French actress Brigitte Bardot. In one scene she is leaning over a juke box and she flicks up her red skirt and we see her black underpants. She then dances on a table top whilst men sit and admire her and her skirt again flies up so we see her underpants.

THE COMPLAINT

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

In the ad there is significant sexualisation of the model and one shot where she flips up her skirt showing her underwear - and butt. While that in itself is not offensive - the fact that she is underage/ was underage at the time of filming the ad is incredibly offensive. Daphne Groeneveld was born Dec 24 1994. She is currently only 17 years old. I'm not objecting to the way the model is portrayed I think it is in keeping with this particular brand/ sub brand of perfume. They are trying to portray a sense of cheekiness - but I'm seriously objecting to the overt sexualisation of a young girl who isn't even old enough to vote. I'm sure her parents cringe every time they see their daughters bum appearing on peoples TV screens. I'm not a parent and it makes me cringe it makes me very uncomfortable even disgusted. It puts me off having anything to do with my other Dior scents. I truly hope you share this complaint with

the advertiser I've been buying Dior products for years and I've just stopped. I'm also going to make sure that my mum and sisters and female colleagues at work also stop buying Dior products. My reasons are in line with section 2. The girl portrayed is very young. There is a close up of when her buttocks are revealed under her short skirt. I believe the ad portrays sex and sexuality out of context and is offensive in its objectification of women. The sexual content of the ad does not reflect the product it is selling. I have also seen this ad within children's viewing hours. I consider it distasteful over-sexualised and distasteful. My reasons are in line with section 2. The girl portrayed is very young. There is a close up of when her buttocks are revealed under her short skirt. I believe the ad portrays sex and sexuality out of context and is offensive in its objectification of women. The sexual content of the ad does not reflect the product it is selling. I have also seen this ad within children's viewing hours. I consider it distasteful over-sexualised and distasteful.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

As is clear from the context of said advertisement neither contain any overtly offensive behaviour nor any significant sexualisation of the image. The message of the Dior Addict ad is "celebrating happiness and joie de vivre". Daphne was 15 when she starts to work for the biggest couture houses. Dior chose her for her beauty as well as her modern face. Dior always paid great attention to its communication and would never have created an inappropriate advertising concept. We feel very much sorry for this misunderstanding.

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 complainants' concerns that the advertisement features a sexualised depiction of a young girl which is objectifying and inappropriate.

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, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief.'

The Board noted the advertisement features a model on a beach in a bikini and then dancing in the streets and in a bar/restaurant whilst clothed.

The Board noted that the advertisement is for perfume for women and considered that the use of a female model to promote the product does not of itself amount to a portrayal which discriminates or vilifies a person on account of their sex.

Based on the above the Board determined that, in this instance, that the advertisement did not depict any material that discriminated against or vilified any person or section of society.

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

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 complainants' concerns over the age of the model and that the advertiser had confirmed the model turned 17 years old the month after the advertisement was filmed.

The Board considered that the model appears to be older than she is and that she is presented in a manner which suggests she is a young, confident woman and not in a manner which suggests she is a young girl.

The Board noted that model appears empowered, happy and in control throughout the advertisement and considered that she is not represented in a manner which could be considered exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisements 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 2.4 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience."

The Board noted that model flashes her underwear on a couple of occasions throughout the advertisement and considered that the manner in which she does this is playful rather than sexual and that her underwear is modest and not revealing and that it is done in the context of her dancing to music. The Board noted that in some scenes the model is dancing on a table top whilst men watch her and considered that the men are of a similar age to the female and that their reactions to her are not threatening, menacing or inappropriate.

The Board noted that the advertisement is set during the day time and that the overall tone is happy and playful and considered that whilst the model is clearly aware of her sexuality she

does not use it in a manner which is inappropriate in the context of an advertisement for a European fashion house's perfume.

The Board noted the advertisement had been rated PG by CAD and considered that the content of the advertisement was not inappropriate for the relevant PG audience.

Based on the above the Board considered that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and 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.