



Case Report

1	Case Number	0507/10
2	Advertiser	EMAP Australia Pty Ltd
3	Product	Media
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	08/12/2010
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement opens with a very busy young woman serving an enormous kebab to two young men from a kebab van. One of the men is wearing a white tshirt with Zoo written in large red letters across his chest.

A male voice over then describes this week's Zoo weekly magazine which features a "real life Russian spy in her undies" and we see the article on the screen. The voice over goes on to say the magazine also features the "ten hottest real girls in Australia" and we see an image of them, too.

THE COMPLAINT

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

This advertisement was screened during Sunday night's Junior Master Chef program on Channel 10. The nature of this program is strongly family orientated. The advertisement showed images of women in sexually suggestive poses and wearing little clothing. The screening of this advertisement during a family styled program such as Junior Master Chef is thus inappropriate and tasteless.

I object strongly to the advertisement for the following reasons:

It was shown at 7:45 pm during a program which primarily has children as the stars of the show - a program which I am sure many children watch. Secondly the ad promotes the lust of the female flesh - particularly enticing for young boys and teenagers. Thirdly this kind of filth corrupts young minds and develops a warped perspective in them of the role that women

play in society. Fourth if young people actually get a hold of (they don't have to buy it) this material they can become addicted to pornographic material and lives can be destroyed as a result. Fifth I object to the fact that some fool actually thought that this was ok to show during such a program and at such a time...that rather than do the right thing he or she took the money instead.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Zoo Weekly is Australia's most successful men's magazine, now selling over 100,000 copies each week.

Sport, News, Girls and Gags are topics our target market seek out and are the cornerstones of our editorial direction.

Our core audience recognise amusing moments in life and react in certain ways. We've tried to capture this through our latest TV advertisements with Zoo man recognising these moments and remarking, "That's Zoo." We take steps to ensure that all parts of the advertisement including content and the magazine pages that appear are suitable for the rating we are granted. These are included in our liaisons with Commercials Advice Pty Ltd (CAD).

All possible steps were made to ensure the advertisement complied with Commercial Television Industry Code of Practice and the kebab execution was classified with a 'PG' rating'. We ensure ads only appear in the appropriate timeslots for the target market. Also included in the process, were ongoing liaison with CAD at concept, script and edit stages. In regards to section 2.3, "Advertisements shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone" and section 2.1, "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 face, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief":

The advertising agency engaged with CAD at the script, pre-production & post-production stages, where direction was taken on the visuals and audio to ensure the advertisement was suitable for the relevant viewing times.

The advertisement does not portray any persons in an inappropriate manner, and there is absolutely no nudity in this advertisement.

We hope that this adds clarification about the intent of the Zoo Weekly advertisement and provides the required background information, please do not hesitate to contact me should you need anything further. I would like to reiterate that every step was taken to ensure this advertisement complied with all required regulations.

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 was screened during a program that has a strong family orientation and features images of women in sexually suggestive poses wearing little clothing.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone”.

The Board noted the advertiser’s response that they have taken steps to ensure that all parts of the advertisement including content and the magazine pages that appear are suitable for the rating, in this instance PG.

The Board noted that the advertisement has a PG rating and that it has only appeared in the relevant timezone. The Board noted that the advertised product is a magazine with a male readership and is also classified as a category that is able to be advertised in general media.

The Board considered that the image of the woman's breasts in the van in the opening part of the advertisement was not offensive. The Board considered that there was no sexual connotation in this part of the advertisement, with the man exhibiting lust towards the kebab - not the woman. The Board noted that the other images in the advertisement depicted women in underwear and considered that most people would find the images mildly sexual but relevant to the product and not inappropriate for the relevant audience and timezone.

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 2.3 of the Code.

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