



# Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0516/16</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Shedd</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Clothing</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>Billboard</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>07/12/2016</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

## ISSUES RAISED

- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women
- 2.3 - Violence Causes alarm and distress

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This billboard advertisement features a fur jacketing being held by the hands of various women. The headline reads “Instagrammed 3 times already @Poppy Lismann. Shedd it.” The Shedd logo is in the top right hand corner.

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*It is completely offensive to me as a woman to see disembodied parts of a woman's body used to advertise clothing. It's gruesome and disturbing.*

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

*These ads were designed to resonate with women in the target market for the app, each billboard scenario reflects a genuine reason, taken from research, young women who when asked why they might Shedd an item.*

*The ad does not feature 'disembodied parts' of a woman's body. The hands in the advertisement come through a hole in the wall to suggest women will either 'want it' or 'sell it'*

*The advertisement is about inspiring and empowering women to recycle and reinvent their wardrobe to ensure no fashion item ever only gets one wear.*

*We do not feel we this advertisement breaches any Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics. Please let us know if you require any further information.*

## **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 that the advertisement featured disembodied parts of a woman's body and that this was violent and disturbing.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code states: "Advertising or marketing communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people."

The Board noted that this billboard advertisement features a fur jumper held up by a woman's hand, another woman's hands can also be seen appearing out of the sleeves of the jumper. The text includes "Instagrammed 3 times already..." and is promoting an app which allows users to sell unwanted clothing.

The Board noted that in order to be in breach of this section of the Code the image would need to use sexual appeal in a manner that is both exploitative and degrading.

The Board noted the Practice Note for Section 2.2 which provides the following definitions:

- "Exploitative means clearly appearing to purposefully debase or abuse a person, or group of person, for the enjoyment of others, and lacking moral, artistic or other values;
- Degrading means lowering in character or quality a person or group of persons."

The Board noted that the advertisement was promoting the sale of a no longer wanted piece of clothing and that the hands of the women represented the old and new owners. The Board considered that only the women's hands are visible and that their depiction did not show the women in an exploitative or degrading manner. The Board also noted that the advertisement did not contain sexual appeal.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading to any individual or group of people.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not present or portray violence unless it is justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised".

The Board noted that while only the hands of the women were shown, the advertisement is stylised, and the advertisement did not suggest that the women had been dismembered or that there was any violence involved in the advertisement.

The Board considered that the interpretation of the advertisement being violent was one unlikely to be shared by the wider community.

The Board determined that the advertisement 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.