



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	400/06
2. Advertiser	Di Bella Coffee
3. Product	Food & Beverages
4. Type of advertisement	Print
5. Nature of complaint	Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 10 October 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement depicts the torso and upper thighs of a woman wearing black briefs, a navel piercing and the words “Di Bella Coffee” and its logo tattooed on her pubic region. She is stretching the waist straps of her briefs away and down from her body.

THE COMPLAINT

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

What does an almost naked woman pulling her skimpy little briefs has to do with coffee? I am not the only one who finds it extremely offensive and distasteful.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

I would like you to know that I truly value your opinion and appreciate your email. The intention of the ad was not to offend, so I sincerely apologise that you feel this way. The creative department at MAP magazine encouraged us to run this ad as they believed it would be successful. They believed it would actually appeal to their target market according to their demographics. The ad was also used as a ‘test’ to see how the market would react, I assure you that this advert was a once off for that reason.

The below statement in reference to the ad is from MAP magazine:

‘I wish to state that map magazine prides itself as an ethical publication with integrity regarding media. map magazine would not publish anything it deems to be unsuitable or distasteful for our readers. In reference to the Di Bella ad in question, map has had much positive feedback from it’s savvy inner-city reader. We would happily print the ad again and believe it is not offensive and in good taste for our readership nor is it crossing any advertising legalities that we are aware of.’

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 whether the advertisement contravened the section of the Code dealing with sexuality, sex and nudity.

The Board viewed the ad and noted that the advertisement was sexually provocative and that it did depict very low cut underwear on the model. The Board noted that the advertisement appeared in

MAP Magazine – a Brisbane city magazine directed at young, professional, urbane inner-city dwellers who were unlikely to be generally offended by the sexual suggestion of the advertisement.

On the basis of the audience likely to view the advertisement, the Board considered that the depiction of sex and partial nudity was sensitive and did not breach section 2.3 of the Code.

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