



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	489/06
2. Advertiser	Emap Australia (Zoo Weekly - Krystal's Real Girls)
3. Product	Media
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	Tuesday, 12 December 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The television advertisement features Krystal (from Big Brother) lying on a bed announcing “Over the past few months I have been bringing you real girls from all over Australia but I can’t decide which one is the hottest”. Shots of various girls wearing bikinis and/or underwear are seen from past issues of Zoo. Krystal continues “This is where you come in. If you get this week’s Zoo you can vote for your favourite”. A male voiceover says “Thanks Krystal. This week’s Zoo...only \$1.95”.

THE COMPLAINT

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

It showed a number of women scantily clad in suggestive positions, advertising the magazine and the 'girls' within it.

I'd like to point out that it is in breach of section 2.1 and 2.3 of the of the AANA Code of Ethics. The ad was extremely degrading to women.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

The target consumer for Zoo Weekly is an 18-34-year-old male. This audience is a key demographic for advertisers who, in their desire to communicate in an appropriate language and tone, will often employ beautiful women and imagery to appeal to this audience. The Zoo Weekly ‘Real Girls’ TVC is firmly within this tradition, and is in no way intended to offend.

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

This was an advertisement made for a specific issue and therefore will not be on air again in the future.

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 noted the shots of the various models in lingerie and noted the tone and language of the woman speaking. The Board noted that, while there was a sexual undertone to the advertisement, the exposure of women in underwear was unlikely to cause offence to large sections of the community. Accordingly the Board determined that the advertisement did not deal with sex, sexuality or nudity insensitively, given the audience, and hence did not contravene section 2.3.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement contravened Section 2.1 of the Code, concerned with discrimination and vilification. The Board noted the complainants' comments that the advertisement was degrading to women. The Board agreed that the use of women in underwear to attract customers to a magazine did not of itself constitute discrimination against or vilification of women.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.