



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 67/08 |
| 2. Advertiser | Emap Australia (Zoo Weekly) |
| 3. Product | Media |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Wednesday, 12 March 2008 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on the Zoo office where the usual "unusual" staff go about their daily business. A male staffer relates "Welcome to the offices of Zoo Weekly, toughest working conditions on earth. I mean wouldn't you think...if we produce a Zoo magazine that reveals Zoo's Boob Job Winner...and...has Emily Scott wearing next to nothing, it'd be worth more than two dollars fifty? Two dollars fifty!"

THE COMPLAINT

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

What messages will this send to young teenagers and older children, all of whom are included in the typical Home and Away audience. Such messages will tend to drive home to young women and girls that they are only valuable if they conform to the narrow bounds of what is considered attractive and acceptable. They will no doubt pick up strong messages that to fit in they will need to submit to being objectified sexually and even that they will need to self objectify their bodies. Many experts on psychosexual development are increasingly concerned about the impacts such messages are having on girls and women's self esteem and mental health. Such messages will only contribute to encouraging young teens into premature and soul destroying sexual involvements. Research shows that such involvements leave adolescents vulnerable to coercion, sexual assault, and being used. Emotional difficulties can be severe for young teens when they get hurt by relationship breakups and coerced sex. There is more that could be said on this. The impact on boys and young teen males should also be considered. Again such messages encourage them to see girls and women as merely objects for their sexual pleasure rather than whole persons. Such messages will tend to encourage sexually predatory behaviours ranging from undressing young women or girls with their eyes, through to pressuring them to undress or forcing them to. After-all, such advertising as this tells them that its normal to objectify and lust after women and to demand their nakedness for male sexual pleasure. In short this ad will have a corrosive sexualising effect on both boys and girls in the audience ranging from tween ages through to older adolescence. Growing evidence indicates this will be far from a healthy outcome.

Smutty add aimed to sell a magazine flashing scantily clad girls in underwear and lingere enticing men to buy it and reduce themselves to brainless penisthinking amoebas. Do we really need this rubbish flashed on television. As it is this magazine is flashed all over counters in shops everywhere. I enjoy sitting down to watch a show and find it deeply offensive that mens stick magazines need to be put on the air. It is very backward thinking. You can say in your other complaints about this ad that the women are wearing something so it makes it ok. Please! It aims to support those men that cannot keep it in their pants and also encourages adultery, relationship breakdown and divorce. Get it off tv and upgrade your standards a little. TV is meant to be enjoyable for everyone not just men. Show me a night on your station that doesn't show a nude or

half naked women and you might receive a few more votes from female members of the square eye world.

Demeaning ad content which objectifies women and looked like an ad for a pornographic magazine. This ad was shown during early evening but would be offensive at any hour.

It was shown during a PG rated tv program at family viewing times. The ad may influence paedophiles as it has the image of a seductive women on a child's swing. The boob job is degrading to girls and womens images (as well as verbally saying this line is a low act) and the verballing of sex is uncalled for. This magazine is rubbish and the ad is a poor attempt to sell rubbish. The advertiser should be ashamed of themselves..would they like their daughters to be in this ad..or worse still the magazine??

We are watching the cricket which is a family program (with our young children) and have this ad come on with girls in lingerie laying suggestively - it was offensive both to myself and my family.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Zoo Weekly is Australia's most successful men's magazine, now selling over 120,000 copies each week. Sport, News, Girls and Gags are topics our target market seek out and the cornerstones of our editorial direction. Our core audience 'imagine' that a job at Zoo Weekly would be fantastic – unreal. And it is exactly this – the fantasy - that our new television campaign captures.

The ad is humourous; it is not a realistic representation of the working environment - it is not intended to be. We feel that the humour, the sarcasm and the tongue-in-cheek tone reinforces the fantasy surrounding a job at Zoo. All possible steps were made to ensure the advertisement complied with Commercial Television Industry Code of Practice so that it was able to achieve a 'PG' rating, and to ensure the ad only appears in the appropriate timeslots for the target market.

In regards to section 2.1, "Advertisements shall not portray people or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief."
§ *The advertising agency engaged with Free TV Australia at the script, pre-production & post-production stages, where direction was taken on the visuals and audio to ensure the advertisement was suitable for a PG time zone.*

§ *The advertisement does not discriminate against anyone as stated above.*

In regards to section 2.3, "Advertisements shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone."
§ *The advertising agency engaged with Free TV Australia at the script, pre-production & post-production stages, where direction was taken on the visuals and audio to ensure the advertisement was suitable for a PG time zone.*

§ *The advertisement does not portray any persons in an inappropriate manner, and there is absolutely no nudity in this advertisement.*

We hope that this adds clarification about the intent of the Zoo Weekly 'The Office' advertisement and provides the required background information, please do not hesitate to contact me should you need anything further. I would like to reiterate that every step was taken to ensure this advertisement complied with all required regulations.

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 depictions of women in bikinis and underwear and considered that there was no nudity in the advertisement, that all of the women were covered to an acceptable extent and that there was no overtly sexual activity or references in the advertisement. The Board noted that this advertisement is classified for a PG timezone.

The Board noted the reference to the article about Zoo's boob job winner. The Board considered that

the advertisement did treat sex, and sexuality with sensitivity to the relevant audience and programme time zone.

The Board also considered the various depictions of the women in the advertisement. The Board noted that the advertisement depicted women in stereo-typical roles in the office. The Board considered that these depictions, in conjunction with those of the dare-devil, animals and swings, all amount to a satirical, tongue-in-cheek and fantastical situation. The Board considered that the advertisement did not discriminate against or vilify women.

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