



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 157/98 |
| 2. Advertiser | Roger David Stores Pty Ltd |
| 3. Product | Leisure & Sport |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Health and safety – section 2.6
Other - Miscellaneous |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 13 October 1998 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement consists entirely of a series of questions that appear in white print on a black backdrop. The questions are as follows:

Why don't boys with pom poms cheer for the girls?

Why isn't there Friday night netball?

Why is a girl who plays sport called a "tomboy"?

Why is a woman who plays sport called a "lesbian"?

Why does a girl have to wear a bikini to be in a sports magazine?

Why do these questions still need to be asked?

The questions are followed by the Nike logo and then the words, 'Just do it.'

THE COMPLAINT

Comments the complainants made about the advertisement included:

'What we firstly find so objectionable (about the advertisement) is that (the advertiser) ... is deciding and then forcing, when my wife and I are to discuss the subject of homosexuality with our grade three children...secondly...If our children go to school and talk about the ad they may say "Did you see the ad that talked about lesbians?"... Why should our children receive a distorted impression of sexuality to sell sporting goods.'

'(The advertisement) is nothing more than a dig at men and I find it insulting for that very reason...the question...that really gets up my nose and insults my intelligence is "why isn't women's netball shown on Friday nights during prime time television?... They can't blame me, or men, or the television stations... Blame the almighty \$ and companies like Nike.'

'The statements are absurdly connected with sport'

To suggest that such ladies like our gold medal swimming champions are lesbians – not to mention a multitude of women in other sports is way over the top...'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board was of the opinion that the advertisement did not constitute discrimination or vilification and did not breach the Code. In addition Board members were of the view that the advertisement's treatment of sex and or sexuality did not breach the Code. The Board dismissed the complaint.