



## CASE REPORT

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 438/09   |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Snackfoods (Kettle)  |
| 3. Product                    | Food & Beverages   |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV   |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1<br>Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Wednesday, 28 October 2009   |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed  |

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement depicts Angus Sampson sitting around a pool with a party of young women in dresses and swimsuits with plunging neck lines. Angus reads a story to the women and says "tonight we are reading the hare and the tortoise ... and will attempt to relate it to Kettle Chips who are paying for this ad ... now who knows what the story is about"? One of the women responds by putting her hand up and then saying "it is an age old fable that imparts wisdom". Brilliant! "The animal protagonist personify human strengths ...". "That fastest is not always best " and how is that relevant to Kettle Chips? Well, Kettle chips are slow cooked ... unashamably slow cooked for their deeper, richer flavour.

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*Firstly, it undermines women's intelligence. While the women make intelligent comments, the male patronisingly praises them. Their intelligence is further undermined by the constant camera views of their bodies and especially their breasts. Thus, it denigrates women. Secondly, it is an adult ad, for adults. I don't want my sons watching a pg rated show having women's breasts (that are almost disembodied from the real women themselves) paraded like that.*

*I believe it is a growing problem in tv advertising that uses family viewing times to promote sexual content. It is directly contributing to the sexualisation of children, and the acceptance in young minds that it's okay to continue using women's bodies and their sexuality to sell consumerable items.*

*For god's sake, didn't we deal with this c\*\*p in the 70's and 80's? Why do you all allow sexualised content to be shown in childrens/family viewing time? You should be ashamed of yourselves, that you refuse to perceive the inherent sexism and denigration in these ads, and the accompanying sexualisation of children, especially boys, before puberty!*

*Why do advertisers consistently insist on degrading women in our society. Young girls have enough issues to deal with without having to constantly compare themselves to what is unrealistically portrayed on television. I find it very uncomfortable watching this add with my two young daughters. Who are these advertising executives, dirty old men who get a kick out of this stuff!*

*This advertisement is not only gratuitous and sexist but it announces that it is. The message of the ad is "The media is run by men and we want to look at close ups of 20 year olds tits in bikinis. We can so we will find any excuse to do it. And we can get away with it." It is blatant objectification of women and it is the wrong message to send to the all ages target audience of kettle chips. It is a new low. It is taking ownership of it's degrading depiction of women and saying stuff you. We have to draw the line somewhere in the ideology that we are promoting. This ad is one step away from the playboy mansion. What is next if we send out the message that this is ok in the promotion of*

chips?

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*The aim of the Kettle TV advertisement is to talk about slow cooked chips and why slow cooked is better. This is done by relating to the story of 'The Tortoise and the Hare'.*

*The scene used is a pool party, a common place for chip consumption. It is a very premium, aspirational scene, as Kettle chips are positioned as premium chips, targeting an older demographic of around 30+ years old.*

*The guy reading the story is a bit of a personality and has therefore attracted an entourage as he reads the story and relates it to Kettle chips.*

*The girls in the commercial rather than being 'degraded', are actually the ones offering the intelligent comments about the story, how it relates to Kettle slow cooked chips and why that results in a better tasting chip. The line about 'gratuitous pack shot' has nothing to do with the girls, but a play on the fact that Kettle have honestly announced that this is a TV advertisement to sell Kettle chips, rather than pretending it is a real life situation.*

*In regard to section 2.1 of the AANA code of ethics, the advertisement in no way tries to discriminate or vilify any persons. All people in the advertisement are portrayed as attractive, intelligent people. In addition to this we do not feel it contravenes section 2.3 of the AANA code of ethics as there is no sexual references in the advertisement and all people are well dressed considering the scene of an aspirational pool party.*

*Finally, the advertisement was approved by CAD and given a G rating.*

## **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 complainants' concerns that the advertisement objectifies women, is sexist, that it presents women as unintelligent with a male patronising them and that it presents inappropriately sexy and sexist images of women to children.

The Board noted that the advertisement was given a G rating by CAD.

The Board noted that the advertisement clearly presents itself as being a parody of advertisements which use attractive, scantily clad women to promote products for which images of women are irrelevant. The Board considered that the humour of this advertisement was successful. The advertisement depicts stereotypical attractive, swimwear clad women surrounding the man in a Hugh Hefner style scene. However the Board considered that these images were clearly intended to be humorous and that the women were not presented in a demeaning manner. The Board noted that the women were presented as empowered and intelligent and 'in' on the parody. The Board considered that the women's attitude to the male was clearly parody and not likely to contribute to demeaning treatment of or attitudes to women. The Board considered that the advertisement did not discriminate against or vilify women.

The Board also noted complainant concern about the images of the women's breasts and their poses and that these images are inappropriately sexual for viewing by children and contribute to the sexualisation of children. The Board considered that there were no explicit sexual references in the advertisement and that the play on words in the advertisement were very mild and unlikely to be understood by children. The Board considered that the advertisement was not sexualised and that the images of the women in swimwear beside the pool were not inappropriate considering the relevant audience and timezone. The Board considered that the advertisement was not putting the issue of sex before children and that the depictions of the women were not unrealistic in a pool setting.

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

complaint.