



## Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0471/11</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Beehive Vinyl</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Hardware/Machinery</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>TV</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>07/12/2011</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

### ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Sex

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A woman wearing denim shorts, a cropped white shirt and a white hard hat models various items for sale at Beehive Vinyl as a male voice over describes the products.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*Objectifying women. It is offensive (especially the last shot) and she is being used as a 'show piece' she is not demonstrating the products or has anything to do with the product. Purely there for the attention factor.*

### THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

*In response to your letter, please find attached copy of the ad that the one member of the Australian public has lodged a complaint.*

*Ad has being shown through out all Australian states on WIN, GEM & GO stations except for Northern Territory .*

*You will see below additional information from WIN TV you requested in your letter. We have also been approached by other TV Networks to also advertise the ad.*

*With regards to us providing comprehensive comments, at this stage we will only say that we totally disagree with the one complainant's concern, especially her statement that we are objectifying women and that it is offensive – it is a woman who happily done the ad– she was not under duress! Also we vehemently oppose to the notion that the ad could classified under the category as discriminatory or Vilifying woman and that they maybe a reflection of us– we are a family business made up of wives, girlfriends, daughters, nieces. What if it was made known that it was one of our daughters who was in the ad and she done the ad for no money? Will not provide further comments at this stage as we feel the complainant has no substance in her complaint.*

*We would however, strongly reserve the right to make further comments if the ASB felt the ad was against the Advertiser code of ethics*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standard Board ('the Board') considered whether the advertisement complied with the AANA Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board noted the complainant's concerns that this advertisement is offensive as it objectifies women.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.1 of the Code. Section 2.1 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not portray people 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 woman demonstrating various Beehive Vinyl tool bags and that she is wearing denim shorts, a cropped white shirt and a hard hat.

The Board noted that the woman in the advertisement is clothed and considered that her poses are in keeping with showing off a bag. The Board noted that the close up shots of the woman carrying the various tool bags included a close up of the woman's midriff but in the Board's view this is not a depiction which amounts to objectification of woman.

A minority of the Board considered that the woman's clothing was unnecessarily brief and that it was not relevant to the product advertised for her to be dressed in such a manner. The majority of the Board however considered that the woman is undertaking a role unloading the truck and that she is not presented in a sexualised manner and that the advertisement did not objectify women in a manner which would amount to discrimination.

Based on the above the Board considered that the advertisement did not discriminate against or vilify any section of the Community and 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.