



Ad Standards Community Panel
PO Box 5110, Braddon ACT 2612
P (02) 6173 1500 | F (02) 6262 9833

AdStandards.com.au

Advertising Standards Bureau Limited
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1	Case Number	0030/18
2	Advertiser	Yum Restaurants International
3	Product	Food / Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	07/02/2018
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general

2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - nudity

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A television advertisement depicts a mum and dad sitting in a classroom with a school teacher holding their child's drawing. The drawing is a stick figure drawing with the text "Mum and Dad naked wrestling". The parents look blankly at the teacher before the mother looks to the side and says 'did someone say KFC?'. Followed by images of the advertised product.

THE COMPLAINT

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

My three children ages 7, 9 and 11yrs are watching the cricket and this is not of a PG rating or even a subject that they should be exposed to. What a ridiculous ad i am furious.

Inappropriate messages about sex and sexuality at a time when they are not being taught in school sex education programs. There is no parent permission or approval



for young children to be exposed to sexual connotations. Eg A drawing of naked wrestling is referring to two adults having sex. (the child drew the drawing) Then they link this sexual connotation to they don't care they 'love it' KFC. The narrative of the ad illustrates that parents are being questioned by the school over inappropriate images drawn by their child. Parents are asked to come to school because their child drew their parent's naked wrestling. Also, many children draw inappropriate drawings in educational settings that sometimes are a call for help for sexual abuse. The whole ad is off at many levels. What is the link to selling KFC chicken it didn't even need to sexualize this food and dismiss children drawing sexual drawings as humorous, and the parents just don't care? No link or need to sell chicken or KFC

The drawing is what offends me as it is of Mum and Dad naked wrestling, then the mother stares into fairy land saying "did someone say KFC?"

Young kids are watching this program who do not know what this is, it is appalling this is even allow to air in this time slot.

It is exposing younger children to things that they're too young to know/understand about and taking their innocence away.

Using a fast food product as a distraction to downplay the scenario of a child witnessing its parents having sex????!!

COME ON!!!

Degrading and disrespectful.

I'm appalled Channel 10 aired this advertisement!

The big bash cricket is suppose to be a family friendly show, during prime time. While it's ultimately a cheap laugh, it's not the right time to show such an ad about sexual content, even if it's implied sexual content. Children watching the bbl should not need to be exposed to that, nor should parents have to explain the content to their kids when they ask "mum/dad, what's the meaning of that kfc ad?"

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The Complainants stated concerns around nudity and sexual content in respect of the Advertisement.

Relevant Code: Australian Association of National Advertisers Code of Ethics (Code)

The following sections of the Code are cited as being relevant issues raised to date in the Letter:



2.4- Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N- general

2.4- Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N- nudity

Our response below addresses all parts of Section 2 of the Code including the relevant issues concerning section 2.4 of the Code.

Has the Code been breached?

KFC considers that the Advertisement does not breach any part of the Code, including section 2.5 of the Code.

Section 2.4 of the Code provides:

Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

KFC considers the Advertisement reasonably invokes good-humoured connotations of sexuality, and does not portray sex or nudity in any way. KFC does not consider that the ad is more closely referring to the act of sex than advertising the product. The image drawn by the child is clearly of a man and woman hugging in a bed and the images are stick figures without any genitalia drawn. There is no direct suggestion the figures are doing any more than hugging.

The Advertisement and associated posts do not contain any sexually explicit or highly suggestive images or content. Further, KFC considers that nothing in the Advertisement can reasonably be considered to be generally objectionable to the community or to offend Prevailing Community Standards.

Further, KFC notes that the Advertisement is directed at 16 - 34 year olds, and not children (i.e. 14 years and younger).

Further, KFC notes that the Advertisement:

- does not discriminate or vilify any person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual preference, disability, mental illness or political belief (section 2.1);*
- does not employ sexual appeal in a way that is exploitative or degrading of any individual or group of people (section 2.2);*
- does not present or portray violence in any way (section 2.3);*
- does not depict any material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety (section 2.6).*

Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, KFC believes that the Advertisement complies with section 2 of the Code in its entirety.



KFC trusts the response outlined in this letter addresses the complainant's concerns.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (the “Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement featured material that was too sexualised for a broad audience which would include children.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience”.

The Board noted that this television advertisement depicts a couple sitting uncomfortably with their child’s teacher who is holding up their child’s drawing which shows two people in bed and the caption ‘mum and dad naked wrestling’. The mother then looks away and says ‘did someone say KFC?’.

The Board noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement was inappropriate to be shown during family viewing times.

The Board noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement is aired at a time that is inappropriate for viewing by children. The Board noted that the advertisement had been given a G rating by CAD, that it had been aired at a time appropriate for the rating and that the advertisement was shown during programs such as The Big Bash cricket games.

The Board noted the advertiser’s response that the advertisement does not portray sex or nudity in any way and that the image drawn is of stick figures without any genitalia drawn.

The Board considered that the child’s picture is a childlike drawing of two people and agreed with the advertiser that the image is hard to make out as people and that there is no genitalia depicted or sexual images. The Board considered that without the caption of ‘naked wrestling’ it would not be clear from the picture that the figures were naked.

The Board considered that adults would infer a sexual connotation from the image but that this is a humorous reference to the things that small children can inappropriately or inadvertently share at school. The Board considered that the main



impact of the advertisement is the parents' discomfort and that small children would not draw a suggestion of sexual activity from the image. The Board also considered that a reference to 'naked wrestling' even if there is sexual connotation it is mild given the lack of imagery accompanying the text.

The Board considered while the drawing may be suggestive of parental intimacy there is no direct reference to or portrayal of sexual activity. The Board considered that the sexual connotation was humorous, and that the focus of the advertisement is on the parents' discomfort, and that overall the impact of the sexual suggestion is sensitive to a broad audience which would include children.

The Board considered that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

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

