



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 406/09 |
| 2. Advertiser | Lighting International |
| 3. Product | House goods/services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Wednesday, 28 October 2009 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A young couple are in their lounge room and the man is sitting on the couch. The female is dancing in front of him and is wearing a lacy bra, with her back to the camera and the lights go out. The voiceover says "Need lights? Right now you can save up to 30% storewide".

THE COMPLAINT

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

This ad is demeaning to women. It emphasises (heterosexual)male desire by positioning the semi-clad female body as the object of male desire. It asserts that females are sex objects and that male desire is that which must be fulfilled. Implicit in this ad is the message that the young man is the one who is inconvenienced by the blackout, and he too is the one with the money to pay for the repairs. The female in the ad is only an object of pleasure. I have spoken to the manager of Lighting International. He is of the view that if the ASB permits sexist advertising, then so be it. Please remove this sexist and sensationalist ad from our screens.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

In regards to this advertisement I did receive a particular call from this client who had requested me to "take the ads off the air immediately" in which I told her that I wouldn't do that and any complaints that she have should be taken up with an advertising standards board. She did explain to me that she felt it was "demeaning to women and offensive and surely we could think of better ways to sell lights". I did apologise for the ads making her feel that way.

In my opinion the ad is not about demeaning women in any way, shape or form but to add some humour to our marketing campaign. The commercial in question is now off the air and was only aired for a 2 week period running from the 27th September to the 10th October 2009.

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 complainant's concern that the depiction of the woman was offensive and sexist.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted that the advertisement depicts a woman stripping in front of a man. The Board considered that there was nothing to suggest that the woman was

undertaking a demeaning task or that the activity was conducted in anything other than a respectful relationship between her and the man. The Board considered that the image was intended to be humorous and depict an inconvenience for the couple but was not suggestive of degradation of the woman. The lights failed meaning the actual activities were ambiguous and nothing inappropriate was revealed.

The Board also considered that the advertisement did not suggest that all men are interested only in women stripping or have inappropriate desires.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not depict material that was in any way discriminating against or vilifying of women or men and that the advertisement did not breach section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board also considered that the depiction of the woman stripping was discrete and that there was not inappropriate or graphic sex, sexuality or nudity in the advertisement. The Board considered that the image of the woman was not strongly sexually suggestive and that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and 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.