



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 244/09 |
| 2. Advertiser | Emap/Zoo Weekly |
| 3. Product | Leisure & Sport |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Wednesday, 24 June 2009 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This TVC commences with a woman on a tennis court. She is wearing a white relatively low cut top, matching skirt and peak cap. The woman takes a tennis ball from her cleavage and serves the ball over the net. The next image shows a young man sitting against the tennis court fence. The tennis ball bounces to him, he catches the ball and then starts to lick the tennis ball. Images from Zoo magazine edition are overlaid on the screen and voice over promotes the features within the edition. The woman playing tennis is visible in the background.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I would like to complain and object strongly to an ad that was on TV last night 11.5.09 @ 7.15 of Zoo Weekly. Not only do I find this ad offensive and revolting I do not wish my children to see it at that time of night. The perverted people it is directed at would be watching tv at later times. You should consider what audience you are trying to attract.

My 12 year old daughter who stays up til 9.15pm was packing her school bag and saw the ad. Her comment was "why are the cameras showing her boobies with a tennis ball in them"... then for the licking of the tennis ball "oooooh, why did he do that"?

It is disgusting that magazine can start to bring sexual connotations into an ad & think that it is funny or worse, sexy.

Disgraceful that women are portrayed like that for the benefit of men. All the ZOO ads are the same as the magazine pages always follow showing boobs etc.

whats next for ZOO, something shoved done a bikini bottom and the guy gets it and licks it as well!!!

Come on, women watch sports channels as well as other shows and so do our children. The questions from my girls after viewing one of these ads is hard to answer, unless I make a smart comment like -mid life crisis, they can't get a real girlfriend etc

Leave the smut like ZOO off the tv inc. pay tv, where CHILDREN CAN VIEW IT. Sends a wrong message to young adults that womens(ZOOS CASE-VERY YOUNG WOMEN) bodies are there ARE THERE FOR THE MANS BENEFIT, all oiled up, cosmetically enhanced and very sexual. Had enough!!!!!!

Never felt so humiliated as a woman from any ad EVER. Objectifies and vilifies women, not done humourously at all. Very sleazy ad inappropriate for the time-slot, which children would be watching.

It portrays women as objects, reminiscent of those 1950's/1960's magazines such as PIX belittling women as attractive, based solely on their physical attributes and nothing else. It's pretty bad taste, not to mention immoral. How would you feel if your wife/daughter were regarded as okay

based merely on the way she appeared in the flesh?

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Zoo Weekly is Australia's most successful men's magazine, now selling over 112,000 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 of the two executions, the kebab execution was classified with a 'PG' rating' whilst the Tennis execution was classified with a 'MA' rating. We ensure both ads only appear in the appropriate timeslots for the target market. We can assure you that the Tennis execution is only broadcast after the 8:30pm guidelines and does not run in any G or PG rated programs. 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.

The specific content that the complainant 2 and 3 are referring to regarding a man licking a tennis ball is meant as a way to make light of the situation. The tennis ball is treasured as a keepsake. It is far less offensive than if he were to lick the woman. This particular ad ran on Wednesday 6/05/09 at 9:30pm and Mon 11/05/09 in the post 8:30pm timeslot, so in accordance with CAD guidelines and not within programming targeted at children.

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 considered the application of Section 2.3 of the Code, relating to sex, sexuality and nudity.

The Board considered that the advertisement, and in particular the last scene where the man licks the tennis ball, may be regarded by some in the community as in bad taste. However, the Board noted the advertisement had an "MA" classification and therefore determined that the depiction of sex/sexuality was appropriate to the relevant audience and found no breach of Section 2.3 of the Code.

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

complaint.