



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	190/06
2. Advertiser	Vodafone Network (Txter)
3. Product	Mobile Phones/SMS
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 June 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features an attractive blond young woman in a low-cut yellow sundress explaining text-speak (txtspk). “NTCD. No time, can’t deal. DBS. Don’t be shy. Go PLP. And it means like peaking like a parrot. PT4GT. Plenty of time for the good times. And if your girlfriend goes missing you text her MIA? Missing in Action. Like where are you? We just have all these things, little things that we say. I love texting”.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

...it depicts women as a sexual object by putting a young female in a reveilling (sic) top exposing part of her breasts with jewellery deliberately position over the exposed breast area. This degrades women and shows the young lady smiling happily! As her body is used to sell the product.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

The advertisement...forms part of a testimonial campaign....depicting real Vodafone customers telling their own story in their own words and unscripted. The advertisement features one of Vodaphone’s customers discussing how she uses text messages to communicate with her friends and the acronyms they have developed for text messages.

All customers featured were asked to bring their own clothing and accessories to wear for the shoot. The customer was at all times, free to decide what to wear.

We do not believe there is anything in the advertisement, or the way it was shot and edited, that portrays the customer in a degrading or exploitative manner.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board considered that the woman depicted in the advertisement was not depicted in a sexual manner. The Board considered that the woman was presented wearing clothing this is typical of current clothing trends for young women. The Board did not consider that the advertiser was demeaning to women.

The Board considered that it is the advertiser's choice of what images to use, subject to the provisions of the Code, to advertise its products.

The Board noted the complaint about the time that the advertisement was shown but did not consider that the advertisement was inappropriate for a PG time slot.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.