



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 411/07  |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Showtime Australia (Satisfaction)                   |
| 3. Product                    | Media   |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | Print   |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 11 December 2007                           |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed   |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This print advertisement advertises "groundbreaking Australian drama" and features a group of young women in a room with luxury furnishings sitting or reclining on sofas in glamorous outfits. One woman wearing a bustier top, black pants and knee high boots is sitting on the back of a naked man who is positioned on all fours.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*1 - the woman sitting on the back of what appears to be a man (the advertiser was kind enough to obscure his face and his legs appear to have morphed into something I can't recognise) is a clear reference to some sort of sexual power play. I don't care what people do in their bedroom, but my 6 year old daughter thought this was intriguing that a lady wearing a tight corset would sit on a man's back with nothing on.*

*2 - all the women are lounging about in their after five attire, looking supposedly alluring. As we all do. I make sure I have full hair make up and cocktail dress on for my hubby at all times. In short, this is an offensive stereotype of women, and to thinking men, who have partnered thinking women. And it's not even clever, or original.*

*3 - the availability of this ad - once again - don't care what people read or watch in their own time, but there is no parental lock out system on a magazine in the Sunday Herald Sun. It was the wrong spot for this kind of ad.*

*4 - the subtitle 'groundbreaking Australian drama' - good grief! If this is what Australian Drama has come to, we better Cate Blanchett away from the Sydney Theatre Company and see if she can't inject some charisma and intelligence into television.*

*5 - Thank you for reading my complaint. I've worked in complaints - I know it's a thankless job, so I have complained only because I found this ad so offensive, partly because it's so available. And because to women as a group in society, this is just breathtakingly boring and reduces us to the objects that some people wish we would go back to being.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*PMP submits that the Advertisement does not breach the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics. As the owner and operator of premium subscription television program channels, PMP aims to acquire*

*and schedule content that appeals to a broad range of tastes. Sometimes the content on PMP's channels (and the form of promotion of that content) does not appeal to all tastes. PMP's position is that the Advertisement, like the SATISFACTION Series itself, seeks to both challenge and entertain.*

## **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 concerns about a number of aspects of the advertisement.

The Board noted that all of the people in the advertisement are wearing clothes and that the man in the advertisement does appear to be wearing pants - with only his torso bare. The Board considered the context of the advertisement which is an advertisement for a television program which is somewhat risqué and with a mature audience. The Board considered that the images of the women were consistent with the content of the program. In addition the Board considered that the images were not overtly sexual or sexually suggestive and that there was no nudity. The Board noted that this is a print advertisement and considered that the treatment of sexuality and sexual reference was sensitive 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.