



ADVERTISING STANDARDS BOARD

1. Complaint reference number	420/06
2. Advertiser	Fonterra Brands Australia Pty Ltd (Peters & Brownes Chill Milk-Barbie)
3. Product	Food & Beverages
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination (<i>gender</i>) Portrayal of sex sexuality nudity
6. Date of determination	14 November 23006
7. DETERMINATION	COMPLAINT UPHELD

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on Chill product varieties then shots of barn with a Ford V8 FPV Super Pursuit Ute with a Seadoo (jet ski) and trailer attached, and a male voiceover announcing you can win this prize by sending in three tokens from the product packs. He continues “Dang thing costs so much we couldn’t afford a sexy girl for the ad but we know you want her, so here’s the best we could do.” In the style of the movie “The Dukes of Hazzard”, into the barn walks a Barbie-style doll wearing a bikini and high-heeled boots, and carrying a bucket and sponge. The doll proceeds to wash the car hubcaps whilst shaking her bottom to the camera, lying on the car’s bonnet and sliding down the windscreen wiper. She washes the front windscreen on all fours then washes the grille with her bottom in the air, finishing by sitting on the bonnet with her legs apart and pouring the bucket of water over her body.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

It’s blatantly sexual and I find the use of a Barbie doll explicitly tells young girls “this is expected of you. This is what men want”. A doll doesn’t not lessen the explicit nature of the ad.

Using a Barbie doll behaving in a suggestive and indecent manner disturbs me due to the idea they are passing onto young girls.

Extremely denigrating to women. Using a Barbie doll in explicit sexual positions – would children mimic.

I feel indignant simply thinking about the content of this ad and how chauvinistic, sexist, degrading and offensive it is.

This ad discriminates and demeans women. The doll is not “real”...however it is still an image and portrayal of a woman in a lewd and sexual manner.

A child’s doll has been used in a provocative manner.

It implies that a woman is merely a sexual object who can be replaced with a plastic doll.

I found the sexualisation of a children’s toy offensive.

...it instantly attracts children because it's a toy but sends out disturbing sick signals to children.

The poses and acts that the doll performs is what one might expect to see in a soft porn movie.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

With regards to the advertisement complaint for Chill UTE we do not feel that the commercial is inappropriate and that at the time of producing this both the client and agency prepared this with a sense of obligation to the consumer and society and were in no way promoting any sexual reference to children.

We used the doll to replace an actual female and parodied of one of the most popular video clips of the last 12months that played on mainstream TV across Australia.

The use of the doll reinforced the parody of what was a very provocative clip and we are substituting a real woman with something that is not real, making fun of the sexual stereotype. We stress that the video clip was one of the most viewed clips in Australia and part of a motion picture Dukes of Hazard.

It should not be considered offensive as it does not break any section of the code of ethics and I trust the board will see it that way also.

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 contravened the provisions of the code concerned with sex, sexuality and nudity (2.3) and the section concerning discrimination (2.1).

The Board first considered whether the advertisement discriminated against or vilified women. The Board noted the advertiser's comments that the advertisement was a parody of a recent video clip and that the advertisement was making fun of a sexual stereotype – rather than vilifying women. The Board considered that the advertisement was 'over the top' in its depiction of a stereotypical female model and considered that the alleged humour was insufficient to mitigate against the vilifying depictions.

Turning to section 2.3 of the Code, the Board noted that the doll was clearly intended to be highly sexualised, given the movements of the doll, the nature of the dancing and the pouring of water over the doll's breasts.

The Board noted the advertiser's comments that the advertisement was a parody of a recent video clip but considered that this was of limited relevance in the context of considering whether sexuality has been treated sensitively for the audience.

Having regard for the notion of a toy replacing a real woman, the Board agreed that the depiction of highly sexual dancing and gyrating by a child's doll was not acceptable in the light of prevailing community standards. The Board considered that the use of the child's toy made these depictions inappropriate and amounted to the insensitive depiction of sexuality according to Section 2.3 of the Code. The Board noted that although the

advertiser stated that they had placed most of the advertisements after 7.30 at night, the viewing audience for the advertisement would include children and young adults. The Board considered that the inappropriate sexualisation of a child's toy was inappropriate particularly considering the relevant audience, as opposed to the intended audience.

The Board therefore upheld the complaint.

ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE TO DETERMINATION

Thank you for notifying me of the board's decision to uphold the advertising complaint. I can confirm that the advertisement has been discontinued effective immediately.