



**ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BUREAU**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au

Case Report

1	Case Number	0473/11
2	Advertiser	Speedo Australia
3	Product	Clothing
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Transport
5	Date of Determination	04/01/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

National Bus Back/Tram campaign in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth, advertising Speedo swimwear on model and Speedo Ambassador Rachael Finch. Rachel is kneeling down on a sandy beach wearing a bikini.

THE COMPLAINT

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

*The advertisement is for bathers so why is she sitting provocatively?
I found the advertisement unnecessarily provocative and sexual. Swimwear does not need to be advertised on a public bus billboard with a young woman spreading her legs and posing in such a manner.*

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

In response to the complaint received Speedo does not believe that it has acted outside of the AANA Code of Ethics, with particular reference to Section 2 of the code.

The advertisement being referred to is an image of Speedo's ambassador Rachael Finch whose reputation in the Australian public and media is of a highly respected nature. As third runner up of Miss Universe in 2009, Channel 7 host and Nova guest presenter her personality and persona is extremely well regarded.

Speedo's prime focus is to advertise swimwear in an appealing manner to engage consumers. As a respected and iconic brand our integrity and brand ethics are paramount and in no way believe the image to be offensive to the general public.

As part of the campaign Speedo asked people to vote on Facebook between 2 images that would go on our outdoor campaign. 80% of the 1000+ votes were for the image now being advertised on buses and trams. Therefore it was the public that decided that the image in question went on our outdoor campaign.

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 an inappropriate image of women in a provocative and sexualized pose and can be viewed by a broad audience including children.

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

The Board 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 the advertisement features an image of a woman, in a bikini on the beach. She is kneeling on the sand with her legs apart.

The Board noted that it was reasonable for an advertiser to depict its products being modelled in its advertising i.e. a bikini. The Board considered that the pose of the model in the image is in keeping with typical swimwear advertising and is not an unnatural pose for a woman at the beach. The Board noted that the image of the woman is not sexualised.

Considering that the advertisement was not a sexualized image, and that the woman is modelling the advertised product, the Board considered that most members of the community would not find the imagery offensive. The Board determined that the advertisement 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.

