



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 48/07 |
| 2. Advertiser | Gazal Apparel Pty Ltd (Lovable) |
| 3. Product | Clothing |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Outdoor |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 13 March 2007 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This outdoor advertisement features model Jennifer Hawkins wearing a red pants and bra set (Francine in Flame) holding a stuffed toy rhinoceros. She is biting the ear of the rhinoceros and smiling seductively, alongside the question "horny?"

THE COMPLAINT

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

I find this extremely offensive as it not only objectifies women, it is also obviously designed to sexually arouse men. That the term "horny?" should be used on a billboard in such a public place as Burke Road Camberwell is of great concern. This ad is on a par with pornography because of the idea that it conveys.

Horn in her mouth... 'Horny?' for a headline... would have thought the above description would need no further explanation! ... looks like an ad promoting a brothel. Clearly the woman is portrayed as nothing more than a sex object. It can't possibly be targeting women – or is it supposed targeting the men who buy this stuff for their wives and girlfriends – on the hope that, like the model portrayed, they too will prance around in their new Loveable underwear teasingly while sucking on anything that protrudes, is hairy and fits in their mouth? I find the ad incredibly infantile and insulting.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The Campaign... is designed to capture the playful and sultry essence of the brand which the fresh-faced Jennifer Hawkins encapsulates so well.

We wanted to evoke a confidence in women and playfully flirt with male attention.

We believe the majority of the general population can see the humour in the ads and the play on the words as cheeky not sexist.

We actually had a significant lift in our website unique visitors wanting to have a 2nd look!

Jennifer Hawkins is portrayed as being in complete control she is not submissive in her stance and is confident in her attitude.

We acknowledge that there will be a few people that are not comfortable seeing the female form advertised and the intimate category advertised, we respect their opinions but find that the

majority of our 18-30 yrs consumers are not offended.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered whether the advertisement may have breached section 2.3 dealing with sex, sexuality and nudity.

The Board agreed that while the advertisement was sexually suggestive, it also contained a playful play on words that, when coupled with the fluffy toy, detracted from the impact of the sexual element of the advertisement. Accordingly the Board determined that the advertisement did not deal with sex, sexuality or nudity insensitively, and hence did not contravene section 2.3.

Turning to Section 2.1 of the Code, the Board considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.1 of the code dealing with discrimination and vilification of gender. While the Board agreed that there were sexual overtones to the advertisement, there was nothing featured in advertisement which discriminated against or vilified women (or men). Hence the Board held that Section 2.1 had not been breached.

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