



OUTDOOR AND BILLBOARD ADVERTISING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION – WHO WE ARE.....(PAGE 2)
2. SEXY IMAGERY HARMS YOUNG GIRLS – ARTICLE.....(PAGE 2)
3. BARDOT DENIM.....(PAGE 4)
 - (A) ADVERTISING BOARD DECISION.....(PAGE 5)
 - (B) MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA COMMENT.....(PAGE 7)
 - (C) MSA SUMMARY.....(PAGE 8)
 - (D) OTHER SIMILAR ADVERTISING.....(PAGE 8)
4. “DRINK SPRITE. LOOK SEXY.”.....(PAGE 9)
 - (A) ADVERTISING STANDARDS BUREAU CASE REPORT.....(PAGE 9)
 - (B) MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA COMMENTS.....(PAGE 10)
5. MSA OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....(PAGE 11)
6. THE ADVERTISING STANDARDS BOARD OUT OF TOUCH WITH COMMUNITY STANDARDS.....(PAGE 12)
7. FURTHER COMMENT ABOUT ADVERTISING ON BILLBOARDS AND COMMUNITY COMMENTS.....(PAGE 12)
 - (A) SEX SELLS, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU SHOUT - ARTICLE(PAGE 12)
8. MA15+ MOVIES ADVERTISED ON BILLBOARDS.....(PAGE 15)
9. MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA – RECOMMENDATION.....(PAGE 15)
10. PARENTS CALL FOR BILLBOARD TO BE DOWNED AFTER CHILDREN SPOOKED – ARTICLE.....(PAGE 15)
11. SCREAM 4 FILM REVIEW.....(PAGE 17)

12. THE VIOLENT HISTORY OF THE SCREAM MOVIE SEQUELS.....(PAGE 19)

13. ADVERTISING STANDARDS BUREAU DETERMINATION SUMMARY.....(PAGE22)

14. ADVERTISING STANDARDS BUREAU STATISTICS 1998 – 2009.....(PAGE 26)

INTRODUCTION

Media Standards Australia is an advocacy group for children and families in matters of the media. I have been president of this group for just over ten years and have closely monitored the media in all areas. Further, I have also been a professional photographer for over thirty years and have photographed fashion, commercial, industrial, weddings, portraits, school formals, funerals and major social events.

I have also helped businesses promote themselves through my photographs in all facets of the advertising media. I have worked for magazines, newspapers and TV stations as a photographer.

I believe I am indeed qualified as both a photographer, and as president of a group speaking on behalf of children and families, to make comment on advertising and other mediums related to the media and in particular on the portrayal and objectification of women.

Paul Hotchkin (President)

Sexy imagery 'harms young girls'

From correspondents in Washington

February 21, 2007 04:48am

INESCAPABLE media images of sexed-up girls and women posing as adolescents can cause psychological and even physical harm to adolescents and young women, a study has found.

The pressure of what experts call "sexualisation" can lead to depression, eating disorders, and poor academic performance, said the report, released by the American Psychological Association.

"Sexualisation of girls is a broad and increasing problem and is harmful to girls," it said.

Adult women dressed as school girls in music videos, bikini-clad dolls in hot tubs, and sexually-charged advertisements featuring teenagers were among the many examples cited.

Such omnipresent images - on television and the internet, in movies and magazines - could also have a negative effect on a young girl's sexual development, the study said.

Based on a comprehensive review of academic literature, the 66-page report noted that young adolescents and girls were particularly at risk "because their sense of self is still being formed".

School performance can also suffer. In one experiment cited, college-aged women were asked to try on and evaluate either a swimsuit or a sweater. While they waited for 10 minutes while wearing the garment, they completed a math test.

"The results revealed that young women in swimsuits performed significantly worse ... than those wearing sweaters. No difference was found for young men."

The study, which includes numerous recommendations for concerned parents, coincides with a growing wave of public concern about the impact of highly sexed imagery.

The fashion world has been in turmoil since public authorities in Madrid banned under-weight and under-age models from catwalks last year.

The Italian government and two top fashion associations followed suit, signing a code of ethics in December after top Brazilian model Ana Carolina Reston died of heart failure weighing only 40kg.

In France, Health Minister Xavier Bertrand, concerned about the rise of eating disorders such as anorexia and bulimia, recently asked a panel of experts to create a similar voluntary code for advertisers and clothing designers on how the female body should be portrayed.

The US study said sexualisation occurs when "a person's value comes only from his or her sexual appeal or behaviour", when sexuality is inappropriately imposed, or when a person is sexually "objectified".

Looking at popular music videos, the authors quoted songs by the Pussycat Dolls (*Don'tcha wish your girlfriend was hot like me?*), Kid Rock (*So blow me bitch I don't rock for cancer, I rock for the cash and the topless dancers*), and 50 Cent (*I tell the hos (whores) all the time, Bitch get in my car*).

The report said that "sexualisation of women is particularly prominent in advertising" and singled out beer commercials as a major offender.

Also cited was a Skechers shoe ad that features pop singer Christina Aguilera dressed as a schoolgirl in pigtails, with her shirt unbuttoned while licking a lollipop.

The popular Bratz dolls, the study said, depict "girls marketed in bikinis, sitting in a hot tub, mixing drinks, and standing around, while the 'Boyz' play guitar and stand with their surf boards".

The dolls come dressed in miniskirts, fishnet stockings, and feather boas.

The report called on parents to take a more active role in helping to shape the sexual self-image of their children, and to exert consumer pressure on manufacturers and advertisers.

In the US, the sexualisation of young girls became an issue of public debate after the 1996 murder of JonBenet Ramsey, a six-year old beauty pageant contestant who put on make-up and adult clothes.

OUTDOOR/BILLBOARD ADVERTISING – A woman can be fully dressed and still look attractive!

There is no doubt advertising in public places has become frequently raunchy and it really seems that the advertisers have lost the plot. They seem to think that the only way a woman can be presented as attractive is if she is only partly dressed. It never ceases to amaze that companies whose business is actually based on fashion will consistently portray women this way. They are not selling fashion, but sex!

A business that sells clothes and only promotes a woman or man partly dressed isn't taking the opportunity to use that advertising in its entirety and to use the model in the advertising to show off everything that they sell. Is the model being used for her real beauty, and ability to attract, or simply as a sexual object?

BARDOT DENIM



This isn't the first time that a clothing fashion house has used a partly dressed woman in their advertising and one wonders if the advertising company that helped Bardot with this particular promotion, has actually let them down. Of course this photograph is selling sex.

It is also well known that women are more attracted by romance than sex. Why not have a man behind the woman - wearing an ensemble of Bardot clothing and gentle cuddling her, with a sunset or by candle light? Why tell women that their only value comes with their sexiness? And why continue to show women in sexually-provocative poses when there are major concerns with children gaining access to pornography on the Internet and being exposed to sexual content in every facet of the media? This is not an isolated problem but a massive assault on children!

On Bardot's website they show beautiful tops that could quite easily have been worn by this model, and even if the top was taken up a bit to show a little mid-drift, to highlight the "jeggings", the advertiser would not have had any public backlash!

Even the Advertising Standards Bureau, in their decision to dismiss the advert, missed the point of the complaint. It is a very real problem for members of the public to be able to articulate their complaint exactly and accurately! The complainant doesn't always know the exact section of the legislation applying to his complaint.

It is also clear that the ASB only looks at a complaint literally, and not laterally as well. Further, the number of complaints about an ad seem to matter little to those making a determination.



THE ADVERTISING BOARD DECISION ON BARDOT DENIM.

Case Report

1 Case Number 0069/11

2 Advertiser Bardot Pty Ltd

3 Product Clothing

4 Type of Advertisement / media Transport

5 Date of Determination 09/03/2011

6 DETERMINATION Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Sex

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A woman lying on a rug wearing jeans, shoes and jewellery. She is lying on her side and her right arm and the fluffy rug are covering her bosom.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I find the advertisement offensive - that a half naked woman is used to sell jeans. It sends an unhelpful message that this is in some way attractive and acceptable public behaviour

1. I didn't think Bardot was the type to portray such a woman - my perception of the label was classy and sophisticated but to me this advertisement spells cheap and nasty.

2. I think it borders on nudity as it certainly gives the hint loud and clear and leaves no room for the imagination.

3. It is on a bus!!! Children driving home from school in their cars are not protected/have little choice from seeing such a sight - this type of abrupt advertising desensitizes us all to the sacredness of a woman's body.

4. It made me feel shocked and angry that a label that I once regarded highly would stoop so low as to produce something like this - it does not invite young women towards purity and being naturally beautiful. It made me feel like telling all the young women at the three schools I work at to NOT BUY BARDOT!!!

You cannot escape bus advertising because you stop at the lights and you are confronted with it. I have 3 primary aged children who I regularly drive to school/sports etc. It is very inappropriate for them to be confronted with sexualised advertising such as this. The woman is wearing no shirt, is lying down in a provocative pose with no top on, and partially covering her breasts only with her arms. It is very uncomfortable for my children who know it is not something they should be seeing and don't know where to look. It also portrays women as sexual objects when I am trying to teach my sons to view and treat women with respect and to teach my daughter that her value doesn't lie in her outward appearance and to be modest. When I see ads like this I feel like where I live is not a safe or wholesome place for my children to grow up. I am a responsible parent who is very careful about TV viewing/internet but then large ads like this are put right in front of them on a daily basis. If advertisements are to be displayed in public places then they should be appropriate for everyone to see.

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

The Bardot ad was to highlight our new season jeggings (jeans with a denim look and legging feel) and how amazing they look. She's not wearing a top to draw attention to the jeggings.

In reference to the complaint:

Given there is no nudity other than a bare tummy, shoulders/arms and mid-drift (which are all acceptable to show bare in public places) I'm struggling to see how the public can be offended by the creative. The woman is wearing more than you'd see in an underwear or bather advertisement and the intention to draw attention to the jeggings, which is the key selling point for us, shouldn't be treated any differently to an underwear company trying to sell underwear.

In reference to the complaint received on 17 February

*The complaint comes across as very emotional and not very specific. Certainly the intention behind the creative was not to make the woman 'look evil and like she is out to attack someone'. I have no comment on her perception of Bardot and how her perception of the brand has changed. The complaint highlights that the ad 'borders' on nudity which is a blurry claim to make. It either is or it isn't and that is why it is not offensive. I think there is a clear boundary here, one we have not crossed; in no way can you see the woman's breast. In my opinion there is plenty 'left to the imagination'. In regards to children sighting the ad, **I am sure they see more women with fewer clothes on at the beach.** In no way is the woman's body in harm's way or being mistreated so I do not know how it could desensitise people to the sacredness of a woman's body. We did not mean to offend anyone or make them 'shocked and angry'. I do not see how this ad does not 'invite woman towards purity and being naturally beautiful', if anything she's only wearing jeans and shoes and still looks amazing - very natural in my opinion.*

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 image of the woman lying down with no shirt on is inappropriate and unnecessarily sexualized, particularly for the back of a bus.

The Board reviewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response that ad is intended to highlight the new season jeggings (jeans with a look and legging feel). The model is not wearing a top to draw attention to the jeggings.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.3 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the **relevant programme time zone**".

The Board noted that the image is on the back of a bus and is able to be seen by a broad audience.

The Board considered that while some members of the community may find this advertisement to be inappropriate, the images of model posing wearing the product was relevant to the product.

The Board considered that while the ad does depict some nakedness, the nudity does not expose any private areas at all. The Board noted that the model's breasts are not visible and her pose is only **mildly sexually suggestive**.

Although available to a broad audience, the Board determined that the advertisement was not sexualised, did not contain inappropriate nudity and did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it 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.

MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA's Comment:

I. Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s

The advertiser has missed the point of the complaint/s completely even to the extent of mentioning how emotional the complaint/s was. Clearly the public is upset by such an advertisement and clearly it is hard for some members of the public to articulate their concerns. Dismissing complaints based on how "emotional" they are is sheer arrogance.

The advertiser also says that they would see more "women with fewer clothes on at the beach". But this is irrelevant, since an outsider has no way of knowing where particular children are taken and what their parents allow them to see. Many families who do not wish to expose their children to near nudity deliberately do not take their children to the beach. Furthermore, a billboard isn't the beach and has no connection with the beach. And even if women at the beach do have less clothing, but they still wear a top, even if it is a bikini top.

II. The Determination by the Australian Standards Board

The ASB mentioned a "relevant programme time zone" and we ask what that has to do with outdoor advertising? A "relevant programme time zone" would be in relation to television programming and we are reasonably certain that no TV station would place such an advertisement in programme time-slots such as *Playschool* or *Hi 5*, programmes that are specifically catered for children. This would mean obviously that such an advertisement would be likely aired at a later "time zone" – more than likely after 8.30pm.

The Board has also admitted that the advertisement is still sexually suggestive – even mildly! If so, why is such an advertisement allowed to be in a public place?



The Board also mentioned that the idea of the woman not wearing a top was to draw the attention to the “jeggings”. However, why was it shot with the dark jeggings against a dark background? Wouldn’t it have more effect if it was against a **lighter** background? In fact on Bardot’s website, the samples of the jeggings for sale are all against a white background and they all clearly stand out!

MSA SUMMARY

Clearly both the advertiser and the Advertising Standards Board have missed the point of the complaint. Women do not want to be seen as sex objects and the advertiser has missed the opportunity to show women as not only how they could be portrayed but to make an attempt to consider what women really want!

OTHER SIMILAR ADVERTISEMENTS

Again another **Bardot advertisement**, this time the man has no clothes and again inappropriate amongst a group of women. It may be trying to convey a message, but whatever it is, it isn’t a wholesome one!



JUST JEANS

IN ALL OF THESE ADVERTISEMENTS, IF THEY WERE ALL WEARING WHITE TOPS AGAINST THE WHITE BACKGROUND, THE JEANS WOULD STILL STAND OUT AND YOU WOULD HAVE THE SAME DESIRED EFFECT!

GASP DENIM

“DRINK SPRITE. LOOK SEXY”



ADVERTISING STANDARDS BUREAU

CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number 74/08 Coca Cola South Pacific Pty Ltd (Sprite -Drink Sprite Look
2. Advertiser Sexy)
3. Product Food & Beverages
4. Type of advertisement Outdoor
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 outdoor advertisement features an image of a dark-haired young woman wearing a green-patterned bikini, standing in knee-deep water and holding a bottle of Sprite near her crotch. Wording alongside reads, "Truth 10. Drink Sprite. Look Sexy*", and underneath the explanation "*You must be sexy first."

THE COMPLAINT

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

I find it rude, unsuitable for younger people, and everyone, and I believe we are being treated badly, like a lot of heathens and easily brainwashed. Denigrating drivel, and their artists must feel ashamed -

All for money. Not good enough for us self respecting people. This proves that their product is no good; and how far will they go to sell this - for money, not for our good, but to our detriment; contributing to obesity, tooth decay, and poor nutrition.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The complaint refers to our current Sprite campaign titled 'A thirst for truth'. The campaign includes out of home advertising and a range of online and viral executions which focus on revealing truths.

The campaign has been designed to appeal to our **target audience of 18 to 24 years olds**. It is an irreverent and humorous campaign that highlights unspoken truths relevant to the target audience.

As with all our advertising we are careful to ensure that material is appropriate for the audience and the channel for which it is intended.

I submit that the outdoor executions of the Sprite campaign do not breach the ASB code of ethics.

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 complaint's concerns that the advertisement was "rude" and "denigrating drivel" and considered whether the advertisement treated sex, sexuality and nudity appropriately as per Section 2.3 of the Code.

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered the pose of the woman to be so ridiculous that it was an obvious and clever use of self-referential humour. The Board also felt that the image was actually mocking inappropriate use of sex, sexuality and nudity in advertising. The Board further considered that the image was appropriate for the target audience.

The Board noted that the advertisement did not portray sex, sexuality or nudity inappropriately and that therefore it 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.

MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA's Comments:

The woman holding the bottle near the tops of her legs is a very sexual image. Holding the bottle elsewhere would not have given a visual message as strong as this. We see many ads with bikini-clad woman, but this one adds the words "sexy" to the message, and includes the image of the neck of the bottle near her crotch. Despite the views of the Board, this renders the ad very suggestive and quite disgusting!!!

It is also hard to see how the ad was "mocking inappropriate use of sex, sexuality and nudity in advertising." The target audience would not be viewing the ad with an idea of discerning the advertisers' intent to mock anything.

Furthermore, if this advertisement was so humorous, why isn't anyone laughing? Obviously Coca Cola has missed the point of its advertising, and if the advert were to reach a target audience of 18 -24 year olds, why was it used as an outdoor/billboard advertisement where anyone of any age can see it?

This ad also sends a mixed message. If Sprite makes you sexy, which seems amazing with its high sugar content, but "You must be sexy first", exactly what is the ad saying?

Again the ASB is using the Section 2.3 of the Code to make a "value" decision when the code in itself is irrelevant to the complaints!

MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- When the words 'sex' or 'sexy' are used and when people are half-dressed or completely undressed on outdoor/billboard advertising, common sense must prevail. Advertisers must be alert to who in the population would be viewing such material and show more responsibility towards them .
- Children are being bombarded and assaulted by sexual content in all media and billboards are just part of the overall problem. The Advertising Standards Board must be more receptive towards the complaints that they receive, and must convey that back to the advertisers. It is unacceptable that the ASB seems not to take complaints as seriously as they ought.
- Generally, most content that is offensive to families will have no bearing on the wording of the "Code" simply because the "code" is just a template that does not take into consideration other aspects of a complaint! For instance the literal meaning in the code is sometimes not relevant to the suggestive portrayal in an advertisement. In other words the overall tone of the advertisement must be taken into account!
- Outdoor posters and billboards are larger than life and therefore have a larger impact, and on a very wide public audience. They are usually strategically-placed where there is a higher volume of traffic.
- A 'G' rating ought to be implemented for billboards and all exterior advertising, and the terms of it must not only be specific but also relevant to outdoor/billboard advertising. The Board must consider children's exposure to adult content, such as objectified and sexual images of women and men, sexualised and otherwise inappropriate text, and also the overall tone of the advertising in its portrayal of its message.
- Also to be taken into consideration should be the high volume of complaints, whether the offending advertisement contravenes the "code" or not! The code serves no purpose if it doesn't even cover the types of complaint that the public make.

MSA accepts that the advertising media is in the business to sell, and the way to sell products is to sell a message. The two main messages being received by children today are: 1. More is better - more money, more things, etc. and 2. Sexy is best.

The first message [i.e. materialism] is a natural one for children to ingest and, in fact, is something which develops from their own natural instincts. Children are naturally selfish and prone to desire more of what is available. We may not like children being advertised as much as is done, but at least it is age-appropriate.

The second message [i.e. sexiness] is, however, unnatural for children. The desire for “sexiness” is a maturation or developmental stage, and is not naturally reached until children are in their teens, and beginning to seek the attentions of the opposite sex. Young children to the age of about 12 years, have neither the maturity, nor the sense, to cope with sexualised images and concepts. Innocence is their right.

Society, therefore, has a duty to keep children free from early sexualising influences. Media advertising, for one, has arrogated to itself much more than is appropriate for children, in this area.

THE ADVERTISING STANDARDS BOARD OUT OF TOUCH WITH COMMUNITY STANDARDS

The ASB has revealed some interesting statistics such as.....

1. The total number of complaints from 1998 to 2009 was 22,742
2. The number of complaints dismissed from 1998 to 2009 was 20,724
3. The number of complaints upheld from 1998 to 2009 was 2,018

Is anyone questioning why there were so many complaints dismissed? No wonder people are so cynical about the complaints system! Out of a total of 22,742 complaints only a mere 2,018 were upheld. That does not sound like the community is being heard, and nor does it sound like the ASB is in touch with community standards.

Further comments about advertising on Billboards and Community Comments

The following article highlights the permissive trend that Australian advertising has followed over the past few years. Even a writer who has a casual, and even mocking attitude, towards overt sexuality, is shocked by the brashness of some advertising. Needless to say, the following opinion does not reflect the opinion of Media Standards Australia, except in its crucial elements.

Sex sells, especially when you shout

James Schloeffel a freelance writer.

April 8, 2011

<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/politics/sex-sells-especially-when-you-shout-20110407-1d640.html>

We don't mince our words when advertising it, but more delicacy is needed.

I arrived back in Australia from London last month. Good to be back. The beer is as cold as I remember, the houses are big, the space plentiful. I've rediscovered a few things about the country that I had forgotten: the traffic's bad, the TV ads are shouty, the Harvey Norman jingle sounds like a group of terrified women escaping from an armed terrorist.

But what stood out for me more than anything else was a bloody great big billboard that read - in big, unapologetic red letters - something like "HAVING TROUBLE GETTING AN ERECTION?" I nearly crashed the car. I've never seen anything remotely comparable in Britain. Or if I had, it probably said something like "Are you . . . well, you know . . . having trouble with, um . . . look, just call us."

No, there's nothing that says "welcome back to Australia" quite like a packet of Tim Tams and a four-metre billboard questioning your sexual prowess. Or, come to think of it, a dirty big sign on a major thoroughfare advertising a brothel. Because, after getting over my initial shock from the erection ad (and texting the word 'hard' to 1800 RAISE IT), I turned the corner to find a sign shouting something like "GOT THE URGE? DO IT NOW" What, at 6.15pm stuck in peak-hour traffic? No thanks. But I appreciate you not mincing your words. Good to be back.

Not that the British don't use prostitutes; they do. It seems virtually compulsory if you want to get a contract in the Premier League. It's just that they don't talk about it in the same way. You practically have to get planning permission to put up a lost or found notice over there, so a penis ad in Piccadilly Circus is a way off.

Here I was, thinking that the stereotype of Australians as brash, crude, larrikins was a bit of a beat-up. All that work I've done trying to persuade the English that Australians are sophisticated and urbane might come undone if they come to visit and see an ad about a hard-on.

Not that a country's billboards reflect the thoughts of the entire population. If the forums and blogs are anything to go by, there are many Australians who would appreciate a bit of discretion, a smidgen more subtlety.

They realise that erection dysfunction is a serious problem that affects a lot of men, but think there might be a more delicate way to talk about it, especially when your kids (and your mum) are going to see it. One woman who lodged a complaint to the Advertising Standards Bureau about a "Want Longer Lasting Sex" billboard claimed her six-year-old son, upon seeing the ad while in the car asked, "How long is it supposed to last?"

And as for the brothel boards - nothing against legalising prostitution; it's better off monitored and regulated. But I don't see the need for directional signage telling me there's rampant paid-for sex going on just metres away.

Before long we'll be advertising brothels on those freeway signs: "Next exit for food, petrol and prostitutes." I'll leave you to imagine what the symbol might be, next to the knife and fork and petrol pump.

Or have I missed something here? Perhaps it's the Aussies who are more grown up. We're comfortable talking about our private bits. We don't shy from our desires. We know what we want and how to get it.

Either way, I've got some toughening up to do now that I'm back in Oz. Otherwise I'll be causing accidents all over Melbourne. I'm thinking of printing out some posters such as "Go On. You Know You Want It!" and "Making Love? Do it Longer!" and pinning them up around the house, just to get me back into the Australian mindset. Before I know it, I'll be ready to face the billboard onslaught again. Nothing will prepare me for those Harvey Norman ads though.

Comments – Community Standards

James may well be surprised, possibly shocked, at seeing sexually explicit ads, but perhaps equally distressing is the way advertising in public spaces is invading our lives. In rural areas we see large billboards stuck in green paddocks and in towns we are visually assaulted by ads everywhere we look. Even the RTA sees fit to compromise road safety by placing ads over roads where they are specifically intended to distract drivers attention,

To my mind these erections are as disturbing as the ones that James is talking about.

frazzle | Epping - April 08, 2011, 7:58AM

Funny piece...but so true. Made my Friday morning after reading the 'serious' stuff about wars, killing...and the idiotic Greens. Thanks James.

dexter | melbourne - April 08, 2011, 8:01AM

Absolutely right, Frazzle. Never mind what it's pushing, although it's a strong reflection of the lack of societal finesse to be bombarded with one of the three formerly taboo subjects. Logo faeces everywhere you look, assault by unwanted products and services around every bend, flick of the channel, turn of a page, click of a mouse, no clean space left uncompromised. I am utterly sick of being sold to. My code is unsine. Indeed.

reality bites | sydney - April 08, 2011, 8:30AM

a funny piece, isn't Australia the best place in the world? Don't you love it that we can laugh at ourselves.

Peter | Melbourne - April 08, 2011, 8:42AM

A friend of mine taught me to discretely cover logos around the house (eg under the TV screen) in electrical tape. It might not work for billboards, but it's a great way to feel like you are distancing yourself from unwanted advertising.

Alex | Adelaide - April 08, 2011, 9:00AM

Yes, this would be a funny article if it wasn't such a serious subject. If the Australia was populated only by adults, I wouldn't have a problem with this advertising either, and I might pin up a few of those signs around my own house. But it's not.

Exposure of children to sexually explicit content in advertising, radio, television and other media is as harmful to children as exposure to violence. It normalises sexually explicit behaviour and makes it harder for children to identify socially appropriate sexual behaviour. It therefore makes it easier for them to fall prey to sexual abuse, including paedophiles, leading to lifelong problems.

I don't know what's happened to media standards in Australia in the last few years, but it's not just the billboards that are x-rated.

Sadly, this is not a funny topic. The media seem to ignore that children exist, and it's not just advertising. I turned on the radio on the way to pick up my kids from after school activities this week, to hear detailed discussions about sexual addiction (where callers ring in to describe their behaviours) and depression after orgasm - between 5 and 6 pm on a weeknight. I am constantly fighting with them in the car as they want to listen to the top 20 music that breaks up these discussions.

I even feel sorry for all the poor men within the normal range who are sucked into medical treatment (with side effects) in the quest for longer lasting sex.

Unfortunately, in this country, the dollar is king. Nobody cares about how all this affects our kids.

KD | Melbourne - April 08, 2011, 9:16AM

Ah, you may be surprised to discover that it's actually illegal to advertise prostitution in Australia. That ad was for something else - I don't know what though. If anyone can produce a photo of it, some research could be done into what it actually is advertising ... but it's not prostitutes.

And prostitution is illegal in Britain. Might be one reason they can't advertise either.

Michele | Sydney - April 08, 2011, 9:22AM

Whatever happened to the fine art of innuendo? If an advertisement for a brothel can't tell me as an adult exactly what's going on while remaining deniable enough for me to tell any children with me that it's an advertisement for a nightclub, the copywriter hasn't done their job.

DisDis | Sydney - April 08, 2011, 9:39AM

Thats the Aussie society for you mate its all about sex and always about sex we live in a nation that is sex crazed, everything out there has to relate to sex and this is bringing up a generation of people that is entrenched in porn, sex, flashing themselves, doing amateur videos etc... The society's technological advance with a major decline in morality... Thats the real Australia for you.

Voice of the Locals | NSW - April 08, 2011, 10:25AM

Who gives a sh*t what the poms do. As for ads, billboards etc. they are all the same, the ugly face of capitalism.

Mick | Melbourne - April 08, 2011, 10:41AM

MA15+ MOVIES ADVERTISED ON BILLBOARDS

In the course of the last couple of weeks, questions have arisen on why MA15+ movies are being advertised on outdoor/billboards.

The first complaint was about advertising on the rear of a Transperth bus where many parents bring their children to school and many children gather at bus-stops. An advertisement for the movie - "No Strings Attached" and depicts two partially dressed actors alighting from a bed. The implication is that these actors have just engaged in sex. A caption then reads "Friendship has its benefits". The implication is that one of the benefits of friendship is engaging in sex. The movie is about friends who "make a pact to have 'no strings attached', to have casual sex without falling in love with each other." The movie has been classified by the Australian Film Classification Board as MA 15+ restricted, meaning "strong sex scenes and sexual references."

The second complaint was about the new movie *Scream 4* where mothers at Albert Park primary say their children are spooked by the enormous *Scream 4* poster that towers over their school. This is a fair call seeing that the movie is a violent horror movie.

The movie, *Scream* and its sequels have had a history of copy cat crime and psychological problems in children who have had access to the MA15+ films.

MEDIA STANDARDS AUSTRALIA – RECOMMENDATION:

We believe that advertising MA15+ movies on outdoor/billboards is totally inappropriate for children and should be advertised amongst other similar-rated content either at the cinema or television after 9.00p.m.

Parents call for billboard to be downed after children spooked

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/more-news/parents-call-for-billboard-to-be-downed-after-children-spooked/story-fn7x8me2-1226037413475>

- Greg Thom
- From: [Herald Sun](#)
- April 12, 2011 12:00AM
- [80 comments](#)



Leah Takach with her kids Felix, 7, and Noah, 5, in front of the billboard.

Picture: Jon Hargest *Source:* Herald Sun

A GIANT billboard promoting a new horror movie has parents at a primary school screaming for action.

Mothers at Albert Park Primary say their children are spooked by the enormous *Scream 4* poster that towers over their school.

It features the masked "Ghostface", an evil knife-wielding killer.

Parents said the billboard was inappropriate and liable to give their impressionable youngsters nightmares.

Mother of two Leah Takach said she feared it would give her sons Felix and Noah bad dreams.

"I have walked past it with my two boys, aged five and seven, on the way to school and they have both mentioned it," she said.

"It is not a very nice picture. I have had to try to explain it is from a horror movie. They do tend to dwell on this kind of thing and wake up in the middle of the night frightened."

Another school mum, Janine Barrett, said her two young children, Jensen and Addison, had also been disturbed by the image.

"It's a very odd spot to have something like that - across the road from a primary school," she said.

Ms Barrett says she wants the poster removed. "It's a horrible mask," she said.

READER COMMENT

- *Hello of melbourne Posted at 9:59 AM April 12, 2011*

My daughter is seven and has seen the ad for the movie in the commercials on tv. She is not staying up late it was played at 8pm - 3 nights in a row she has had nightmares directly about the mask so i tend to agree with the parents it is inappropriate. For those that say the mask means nothing - he is not exactly smiling!!!!

SCREAM 4 Film (35 mm)

Classification
MA 15+
Consumer Advice
Strong horror violence
Category
Film - Public Exhibition
Version
ORIGINAL
Duration
111 minutes
Date of Classification
12/04/2011
Author
WES CRAVEN
Publisher
WES CRAVEN / IYA LABUNKA/ KEVIN WILLIAMSON
Production Company
DIMENSION FILMS
Country of Origin
USA
Applicant
ROADSHOW FILMS
File Number
T11/1416
Classification Number
246739



Film review: Scream 4's in sync



<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/ipad/film-review-scream-4/story-fn6bn9st-1226038746375>

- Leigh Paatsch
- From: *National Features*
- April 14, 2011 12:00AM

Emma Roberts and 'Ghostface' in a scene from film Scream 4 *Source:* Supplied

IT has been over a decade since the Scream brand was deactivated.

In that time, a whole new wave of crappiness has swamped the horror genre. Today's horror movies are definitely full-on, but they are rarely fun.

So it is easy enough to understand why the original creators of all things Scream, director Wes Craven and writer Kevin Williamson, are back with a fourth instalment.

In the grand Scream tradition, Scream 4 opens with a pre-credits, movie-inside-a-movie which heralds the re-launch of the franchise's weapon of mass acupuncture, Ghostface.

You will be happy to know that Ghostface is still getting around in that iconically creepy mask-and-robe ensemble.

And as it should be in the Scream universe, Ghostface is also still finding plenty of dumb teenage women home alone, and ready to take all of his many pre-stabbing phone calls. (Just once it would be great to find out what Ghostface would do if he was put straight through to voicemail.)

Craven and Williamson cleverly front-load the prologue with tons of great lines and double-whammy twists (the movie-inside-a-movie effect is multiplied, Inception-style), winning over the audience quickly before the tried and true material comes into play.

There is not too much of the Scream 4 plot that needs to be telegraphed in advance. As expected, the franchise's indestructible heroine, Sidney Prescott (Neve Campbell), is once again a magnet for brandished blades.

Now an author and back in her home town to promote a new self-help book, Sidney is soon an object of scorn for the locals. Why? Because Ghostface is killing all their kids in celebration of her return. Well paced and shrewdly written, Scream 4 works just fine as both a whodunnit and a who's-gonna-get-it-next.

Though Campbell does a good job of anchoring the film, her other castmates from the earlier Screams (such as David Arquette and Courteney Cox) get too much screen time for too little return.

The younger, next-gen players (led by Emma Roberts, Rory Culkin and Hayden Panettiere) are much more in sync with what is required here, and could have been entrusted with more of Scream 4.

Scream 4 (MA15+) Star rating: * * * Director: Wes Craven (Scream) VISIT scream-4.com

Starring: Neve Campbell, Emma Roberts, Rory Culkin, Hayden Panettiere, Courtne Cox, David Arquette

THE VIOLENT HISTORY OF THE SCREAM SEQUELS

Scream Movie inspired Killers.

Los Angeles - Two teenage cousins, Mario Padilla, 17 and Samuel Ramirez, 16 said the slasher movie Scream inspired them to kill Mario's mother, Gina Castillo in a frenzied stabbing attack - have been jailed.

On January 13, 1998, the two boys burst into the Padilla home where Mario grabbed his mother from behind as she sat in front of her computer. Then while Ramirez held her down, Padilla used at least four different knives and a screwdriver to stab his 37 year-old mother 45 times.

Evidence at a preliminary hearing showed the boys were obsessed with the Scream and its sequel, Scream 2. In the movies, killers in Grim Reaper costumes stab teenagers.

The boys said they murdered and robbed Mrs Castillo to get money to buy costumes like those used by the movie killers. They then planned to kill several classmates while wearing the costumes. – Associated Press

(The West Australian July 24, 1999 - page 20)

Girl "Trapped" in Video.



Scream Mask



Scream Video Cover

A 10 year-old is in a psychiatric ward with a severe trauma after watching a violent video. Doctors say her mind is "trapped inside" the movie. The girl from a south-eastern Melbourne suburb, watched the horror movie Scream at a sleepover birthday party with other children. Doctors say she began role-playing characters in the movie and became extremely violent. Two other children who saw the movie, which has a Mature Audience classification, have suffered regular nightmares.

The girl's mother came home from work to find her daughter lying on the couch "looking shattered and twisting her fingers". "Her pupils were dilated and she had a glazed look," her mother said. "But we thought she may have just been very, very tired."

That night the parents woke to find their dazed daughter wandering around their house. She went back to sleep the next morning woke totally confused. On the advice of their family doctor they took her to Frankston Hospital where blood and urine tests confirmed there were no drugs in her body. Eighteen hours later she was admitted to Melbourne's Royal Children's Hospital.

"She could not recognise people and gave doctors silly answers to questions they asked," her father said. "A doctor held out his tie and asked her what it was. She replied it was a watch. He then pointed to his watch and asked her what it was. She said she didn't know." The girl spent five days in hospital and then doctors decided she had made enough progress to return home for the weekend. But in the car on the way home, she became extremely agitated, staring and rubbing her arms and hands as if to wipe something off them.

"Next thing," said her mother, "she started yelling at me, 'you are not my mother, you are a bad mother'. She started slapping and kicking me. She managed to get the window open and started to try climb out as we were moving."

The mother stopped the car and called the ambulance. As they waited, the girl locked her teeth into the mother's arm. Then she bit her mother's finger.

Ambulance officers restrained her but she bit through one of the restraints on the trolley. "She had incredible strength," her mother said. "She was fighting, in her mind, for her life." At the hospital she began screaming, and punched a nurse.

The next day doctors decided to transfer her to a specialist psychiatric facility at the Austin Hospital.

The deputy convenor of the Film and Literature Board, child psychiatrist Dr. Brent Waters, said the case highlighted the need for parents to be aware of what children were watching.

(Sunday Times 26th April 1999)

Horror Show.

Paris: A teenage boy obsessed by the new film Scream 3 put on a cloak and mask and stabbed his parents with a kitchen knife. His parents survived.

(Sunday Times 23rd April, 2000 – page 30)

Creator of *Scream*.

Hollywood's master of horror, Wes Craven who also directed *Nightmare on Elm Street* says that he makes no apologies for the violence in the *Scream* films, which are often blamed (rightly or wrongly) for real-life urban violence.

(The West Australian TODAY - 22 March, 2000 – page 8)

Star of "*Scream*" Says...

"I'm so bad when it comes to horror films. I'm one of those people who cries and screams a lot and then has nightmares for months afterwards, but I've come to really appreciate them, obviously."

*Neve Campbell (Star of *Scream*)*

(December 20, 1996 Web posted at: 11:45 p.m. EST NEW YORK – CNN Website)

President Paul Hotchkin

Vice President Gail Gifford

Secretary Carol Phillips

Patron Jennie Bickmore-Brand

PO Box 4266, Canning Vale East, W.A. 6155

Telephone (08) 9403 6275

E-mail viewers@mediastandards.org

Website www.mediastandards.org

Determination summary

Portrayal of gender in advertising¹

Interpretation guide

- This document provides a general overview of Board determinations on complaints about the portrayal of men and women (gender) in advertising.
- It is not a “how to” guide, nor does it cover all situations which require care in gender portrayal.
- It is designed to assist the advertising industry, the self-regulatory body, consumers and others interested in ensuring that portrayal of women and men in advertising is positive, responsible, suitable for general viewing and contributes to the elimination of systemic discrimination based on gender.
- The Board seeks to ensure that the overall impression of any communication does not violate the spirit of gender equality even though the elements may not violate any particular guideline.
- Humour, works of art and historical settings can all be positive elements in advertising. However, the Board will consider whether in its opinion, these techniques are used as an excuse to stereotype men or women or to portray behaviour which it considers unacceptable today.
- This document refers to specific ASB case numbers to provide practical examples of the issues under discussion. These were current at the time of writing and should be used as a starting point only – please refer to the ASB website for more up to date examples.

Relevant sections of the *AANA Code of Ethics*:

- 2.1 *Advertising or Marketing Communications 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.*
- 2.3 *Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone.*

Definition

The AANA Code of Ethics prohibits advertisements containing discrimination or vilification on account of ‘sex’. The Board has consistently interpreted this term to include not just the physical characteristics of being a man or a woman (such as having breasts or being pregnant), but to also include discrimination or vilification on the basis of gender.

This Summary acknowledges that both men and women are at risk of being portrayed in an inappropriate or potentially harmful way. However, while the Summary is applicable to both women and men, some issues are particularly relevant to the portrayal of women (for example, sexualised images of women).

¹ This Summary is based on an issues paper “Portrayal of Gender in Advertising” produced by the European Advertising Standards Alliance, February 2009

Specific guidelines

Serious and widespread offence

In areas of subjective judgement and often strongly-held beliefs, it is impossible to say that no single advertisement should ever offend anyone. In practice, the Board would normally interpret rules of this sort to mean that an advertisement should not cause serious offence to the members of the group in question or the general or wider community.

Example: [9/09 – Jamba](#)

Research conducted by the Advertising Standards Bureau in 2010 clearly indicates that a significant proportion of the community highly objects to strong and explicit sexual depiction in advertising, especially when the sexual depiction is irrelevant to the product.

Stereotypes of role

In the Board's view it is important to avoid the confusion often made between discrimination and stereotyping (which can be negative, but is not in itself necessarily degrading). It is unrealistic to expect advertisements to avoid showing women and men in traditional roles e.g. carrying out household tasks, caring for children or working on a car. However, the Board would carefully consider suggestions that such activities are 'women's work', or work of little value, or that those who have those attributes are unintelligent or interested only in domestic trivia.

The Board has expressed disappointment in advertising that presents stereotyped representation of gender roles including a narrow or unrepresentative view of women's or men's roles, occupations, professional status, power in the community and level of intelligence. The Board would normally consider acceptable advertising where men or women are portrayed in traditional roles which are not seen as integral to the advertisement, and where the major focus of the advertisement is on the product not the role portrayed.

Examples: [Kellogg's 234/09](#); [Ricoh 355/08](#); [Hybrid TV Services 353/08](#); [Telstra 323/08](#); [30/09 Kellogg's](#); [277/09 Super Cheap Auto](#); [150/09 ANZ Bank](#); [307/09 Virgin Airlines](#); [Woolworths 168/10](#); [Napisan 196/10](#); [Unilever 336/10](#); [VIP Home Services 417/10](#).

Nudity and sexual innuendo

Discreet portrayal of nudity and sexuality in an appropriate context e.g. advertisements for toiletries and fashion, is generally accepted by the Board (especially in certain magazines, but less so on billboards). By contrast, blatant or gratuitous use of nudity or sexuality in contexts where it has little or no relevance to the product advertised, or merely to gain attention, is likely to cause offence and provoke complaints. This would particularly be the case where advertisements featuring scantily clad women appear in very public places such as on billboards to sell items such as trucks, tools etc. The Board has upheld complaints on the basis that such depictions amount to discrimination and breach section 2.1.

Examples: [420/08 – Jamba](#); [249/09 Girls Gone Wild](#); [568/09 Waterson Diesel](#); [139/09 Jim Beam](#); [229/08 Harvey Norman](#); [120/09 Bottom Line Control](#); [Coca Cola 583/09](#); [Lovable 387/10](#).

Nudity may be considered acceptable by the Board, but this would depend on the product and level of sexualisation (e.g. [Ballarat Art Gallery \(411/08\)](#), [Aussie Bum \(31/09\)](#), [Pacific Plastic Surgery \(34/08\)](#)).

ASB's 2010 community research strongly confirms these views demonstrated by the Board in its determinations since 2008. While not applicable under the Code of Ethics at the time of publication of this summary (and thus not able to be considered by the Board), respondents to the 2010 research expressed strong concern at advertisements showing nudity which is irrelevant to the product or which is excessively sexually explicit.

Exploitation as sex objects/objectification

Objectification of a person is to present them as an object to be looked at and acted upon rather than as a person with thoughts and feelings. The Board generally considers it unacceptable for advertisements to exploit people as “sex objects”, or to objectify bodies merely to attract attention. This applies equally to men and women. The Board has noted that use of women and men as sex objects does not necessarily amount to discrimination that would breach section 2.1, but has upheld complaints where the female or male are depicted in an objectified and demeaning manner. A clear example of this would be an advertisement in which a woman’s body is specifically used to sell a product that is unrelated to the presence of the woman in the advertisement. Explicit sexual activity in this context is of particular concern.

Examples: [278/09 – Pharmacare Laboratories](#); [10/09 Jimmy Tools](#); [32/09 – Planbuild](#); [395/09 Target](#); [121/09 Pacific Brands](#); [177/09 Lion Nathan](#) ; [568/09 Waterson Diesel](#); [404/09 MUK](#); [Tiaro Industrial Centre 31/10](#); [Pharmacare 164/10](#); [Unilever 238/10](#); [Kraft 278/10](#); [Unilever 287/10](#)

Age

The Board pays particular attention to age in a sexualised situation. Complaints often relate to how old the model *appears*, rather than how old he or she actually *is*, and the Board will take this into account. Similarly, when older people are depicted, the Board considers it important that women and men are portrayed in similar manner – portraying older women in a less positive light to older men would generally be unacceptable to the Board.

Examples: [197/08 Langham Hotel](#); [72/08 Sex Kitten Boutique](#); [382/09 Bonds](#).

Denigration

Situations where women or men are portrayed as generally inferior to the other sex and/or their role belittled or criticised in a derogatory manner are generally considered to be unacceptable to the Board.

Examples: [167/09 – AMI](#); [214/07 RTA](#); [295/09 Nestle](#); [Allpest 30/10](#); [Australian Egg Corporation 56/10](#); [AMI 220/10](#); [QBE Insurance 249/10](#).

Language

The Board considers that language should be inclusive of both women and men, and that the use of language that is likely to denigrate, insult or offend is likely to be considered unacceptable. The Board considers some obviously offensive words unacceptable, and also that the addition of certain words or phrases could add an inappropriate impact to an image and lead to a perception of objectification e.g. “tight arses, “how tight are your nuts?”, “wait ‘till you see our inclusions”.

Examples: [125/08 – Mortgage Now](#); [452/08 – Statewide Steel](#); [33/09 – Moorilla Wines](#); [83/09 - Jamba](#); [CQ Frames and Trusses 149/10](#).

Other considerations

In addition to the specific issues outlined above, the Board will also consider the nature of the media used when developing campaigns, and the times in which advertisements are placed.

Respondents to ASB's 2010 community research expressed significant concern about these issues, in line with the views of the Board.

- **Outdoor advertising:** Outdoor advertising is in the public domain and has a broad audience. The Board believes that messages and images presented in this medium need to be developed with a general audience in mind and has given particular attention to the placement of such advertising e.g. close to schools and churches.

Examples: [163/09 – Dreams Gentlemen's Club](#); [218/09 – Thomas William Productions](#); [190/09 Guess](#); [261/09 Custom Security Services](#); [Calvin Klein 411/10](#).

- **Digital media:** Given the global reach of electronic networks and the variety and diversity of recipients, the Board believes that it would be wise for digital advertisements to respect the potential sensitivities of a global audience with particular reference to principles of social responsibility and the possibility of causing offence.

Examples: [283/09 – Brothers Ink](#); [American Apparel 141/10](#); [Vic Roads 148/10](#).

- **Timing:** Advertising on television is prescribed by the Broadcasting Act and classified by Free TV. The Board is particularly concerned that only material that is suitable for a particular classification zone is broadcast in that zone.

Examples: [420/08 Jamba](#); [137/09 Coca Cola](#); [315/08 Cartridge World](#)

Level of community concern about this issue

Community activity and political sensitivity about gender portrayal in advertising has been reflected in complaints to the Advertising Standards Bureau **[and was of particular concern to respondents to the ASB's 2010 community research on this topic]**. Such complaints comprised 41% of all complaints received in 2009 (average of 31% of all complaints 2005-2009) and the ASB and the advertising industry have demonstrated their responsibility and commitment to good practice in this area by developing a coherent and responsible approach to the issue. This approach is grounded in ensuring that advertisements are legal, decent, honest and truthful and are prepared with a sense of obligation to the consumer and society.

October 2010

OUTCOME OF COMPLAINTS (No., by Complaint)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Dismissed	927	1553	1971	1291	1191	1770	1349	1753	2648	1730	2263	2278
Upheld	73	111	162	47	11	23	55	94	164	280	477	521
Withdrawn before board determination	0	0	0	0	16	113	236	139	20	15	57	56
Outside Charter	382	401	425	367	354	714	656	970	1212	577	799	941
TOTAL	1,382	2,065	2,558	1,705	1,572	2,620	2,296	2,956	4,044	2,602	3,596	3,796

BOARD DETERMINATIONS (No., by Advertisement)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Withdrawn before board determination	0	0	0	0	6	5	20	33	13	5	10	11
Upheld	5	11	8	6	3	4	8	14	28	36	62	81
Dismissed	262	434	384	363	291	401	337	344	488	405	477	503
TOTAL	267	445	392	369	300	410	365	391	529	446	549	595

AGE RANGE OF COMPLAINTS (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
< 19											2.25%	1.81%
19 - 29											14.99%	15.81%
30 - 39											23.11%	22.35%
40 - 54											30.56%	28.34%
55 - 65											11.15%	11.40%
> 65											3.28%	3.44%
Unspecified											14.68%	16.85%
TOTAL											100.00%	100.00%

GEOGRAPHIC SOURCE OF COMPLAINTS (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
NSW	42.20%	39.10%	34.98%	32.94%	31.71%	37.73%	38.20%	32.68%	36.77%	35.63%	34.47%	36.77%
VIC	13.70%	13.60%	23.92%	23.62%	25.61%	24.75%	22.17%	21.19%	22.59%	20.18%	23.53%	21.16%
QLD	19.60%	20.20%	19.71%	16.47%	18.74%	15.86%	16.16%	24.60%	17.01%	19.79%	20.51%	18.38%
SA	11.20%	10.30%	7.87%	9.20%	7.77%	7.22%	7.10%	8.54%	10.08%	9.80%	9.24%	9.83%
WA	6.70%	11.80%	7.95%	12.43%	10.53%	7.68%	8.84%	7.98%	7.64%	9.80%	7.17%	9.63%
ACT	2.90%	2.80%	2.39%	2.23%	2.95%	4.40%	4.75%	3.39%	2.47%	2.58%	2.90%	2.19%
TAS	2.20%	1.70%	2.06%	2.17%	2.25%	1.52%	1.92%	1.84%	2.31%	1.54%	1.48%	1.62%
NT	1.50%	0.50%	1.09%	0.94%	0.39%	0.84%	0.83%	0.60%	0.84%	0.77%	0.70%	0.45%
Abroad	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.04%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

GENDER OF COMPLAINANTS (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Couple	0.00%	0.00%	6.35%	4.87%	3.59%	2.30%	2.61%	2.10%	1.35%	0.92%	0.92%	0.82%
Unspecified	13.40%	15.20%	7.56%	6.86%	4.55%	2.83%	2.07%	2.10%	3.11%	1.08%	1.13%	4.29%
Male	23.20%	21.80%	25.24%	28.66%	34.76%	32.37%	37.63%	38.08%	36.75%	32.67%	36.93%	36.21%
Female	63.40%	63.00%	60.85%	59.61%	57.11%	62.50%	57.06%	57.69%	60.45%	65.33%	59.04%	59.69%
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

ISSUES ATTRACTING COMPLAINT (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AANA Section 2.3 - Sex, sexuality and nudity								26.49%	22.23%	37.91%	25.61%	40.54%
AANA Section 2.1 - Discrimination or vilification								27.13%	23.25%	28.05%	22.76%	16.31%
AANA Section 2.2 - Violence								17.38%	18.01%	8.42%	17.67%	7.93%
Other								14.59%	14.69%	4.86%	15.84%	17.04%
AANA Section 2.5 - Language								4.36%	7.55%	1.68%	7.24%	5.35%
AANA Section 2.6 - Health and Safety								6.46%	9.70%	10.85%	6.04%	8.38%
AANA Section 2.7 / FCAI Code								3.39%	1.84%	4.91%	3.09%	1.19%
AANA Section 2.4 / Advertising to Children Code								0.20%	2.73%	2.95%	0.49%	0.63%
Food and Beverage Code								0.00%	0.00%	0.37%	1.26%	2.47%
Quick Service Restaurant Initiative								0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.16%
TOTAL								100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

REASON COMPLAINTS FELL OUTSIDE CHARTER (No.)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Outside Section 2 - Dislike of advertising						30	25	19	62	185		
Not an advertisement - Product or service						29	92	58	84	126		
Not an advertisement - Community service announcements						35	61	15	67	99		
Withdrawn/Discontinued - Other						13	43	12	32	81		
Other - Dissatisfied						0	0	0	88	53		
Other - Trivial complaint						4	6	16	5	53		
Not an advertisement - TV and radio promotional material						144	186	28	18	35		
Within Section 1 - Misleading or deceptive						121	186	45	62	32		
Not an advertisement - Local advertising						30	14	21	16	28		
Outside Section 2 - Other						108	70	89	128	87		
Not an advertisement - Program content or programming						73	128	13	15	27		
Not an advertisement - Internet						30	39	11	9	27		
Other - Insufficient information						13	34	23	33	23		
Outside Section 2 - Phone sex						0	1	0	7	18		
Outside Section 2 - Broadcast timing						104	118	60	33	15		
Not an advertisement - Point of sale						27	29	28	16	15		
Specific industry code - Alcoholic Beverages code						3	2	12	5	14		
Not an advertisement - Label directions						2	5	1	7	13		
Not an advertisement - Other						21	48	44	46	11		
Not an advertisement - Loudness of ads						71	12	11	8	11		
Not an advertisement - Product name or logo						5	5	0	3	9		
Other - Other						37	38	31	32	6		
Not an advertisement - Direct distribution to an individual						11	5	1	1	4		
Not an advertisement - Infomercial						1	1	0	0	4		
Within Section 1 - Legality						1	11	6	10	3		
Outside Section 2 - Political advertising						10	11	26	3	3		
Within Section 1 - Business practices						6	6	1	2	3		
Specific industry code - Therapeutic Goods code						1	1	1	0	3		
Specific industry code - Weight Management code						2	2	0	1	3		
Not an advertisement - Direct mail						19	11	3	4	2		
Within Section 1 - Misrepresentation						1	6	1	0	2		
Within Section 1 - Tobacco						3	8	0	0	2		
Within Section 1 - Misleading claim of protecting environment						0	0	0	0	2		
Within Section 1 - Harm to business						0	1	0	1	2		
Within Section 1 - Compliance with law						15	4	0	1	0		
Within Section 1 - Misleading claim about Australian country of origin/content						0	5	1	0	0		
TOTAL						970	1212	577	799	941		

MEDIA ATTRACTING COMPLAINT (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
TV	84.10%	71.70%	71.87%	66.44%	58.22%	80.59%	85.33%	84.81%	85.81%	75.10%	68.59%	59.83%
Outdoor	1.90%	11.70%	18.66%	14.01%	29.77%	9.23%	6.67%	6.67%	12.80%	16.48%	23.92%	23.92%
Radio	2.00%	3.60%	1.22%	1.38%	2.06%	1.69%	1.74%	2.11%	4.10%	2.36%	2.77%	3.12%
Print	10.70%	11.80%	7.41%	13.58%	8.80%	4.48%	5.47%	4.76%	3.85%	4.08%	4.73%	1.92%
Pay TV	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	0.18%	0.44%	1.46%	5.61%
Internet	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	1.13%	1.13%	2.58%
Transport	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	0.41%	0.63%	0.62%	0.45%	1.73%	1.62%	3.84%	2.46%
Cinema	0.60%	1.20%	0.33%	0.35%	0.16%	0.43%	0.50%	0.60%	0.42%	2.46%	0.80%	0.11%
Mail	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%
Other	0.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.15%
Multiple Media	0.00%	0.00%	0.46%	4.15%	0.41%	2.95%	0.06%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

PRODUCT CATEGORY ATTRACTING COMPLAINT (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Food and Beverages						20.85%	28.14%	3				