



Case Report

1	Case Number	0088/12
2	Advertiser	Grosvenor Hotel
3	Product	Restaurants
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Poster
5	Date of Determination	14/03/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Image of woman in short skirt and cropped top and the text includes, "best buns".

THE COMPLAINT

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

I would like to submit a complaint about street advertising in Brisbane City by the Grosvenor Hotel for their ads displayed to the general public which I find denigrating sexual in nature and totally inappropriate for Brisbane streets.

Business: Grosvenor Hotel 320 George Street

It has already been in the media with the Brisbane Times article "Topless bar Divides Legal Precinct" Sept 12th 2011 (<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/entertainment/restaurants-and-bars/topless-bar-divides-legal-precinct-20110913-1k752.html>).

The ads are A3 possibly larger sized posters that are displayed on the outside of the hotel where many people walk on their way to work. The poster images are attached to this email. I believe these ads should be investigated by the Advertising Standards Bureau for these reasons in reference to your Code of Ethics:

2.2 Advertising or marketing communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people.

- These ads exploiting women as a consumer good to be consumed by men and play with food/burgers as their metaphor*

- *The “Rump & Hump” image attachment poster is degrading & exploitative*
- *The language in the posters “Not Just a piece of Meat” and “Rump & hump” “Get Porked” are exploitative and denigrating to women*

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

- *While marketing a service to men these posters are exposed to people on the street going about their business this includes our Elders children women tourists- many of these people have no interest in viewing these images and I do not agree with this portrayal of Brisbane city*

- *These posters are clearly marketing sex to men while using images of women accompanied with language: “get porked” “F*#k Me Burger” “best buns in town” “not just a piece of meat”*

2.5 Advertising or Marketing Communications shall only use language which is appropriate in the circumstances (including appropriate for the relevant audience and medium). Strong or obscene language shall be avoided.

I find this language inappropriate for general display to the community:

- *Implied swearing- “F*#k Me Burger”*
- *Rump & hump*
- *Get porked*

I would appreciate a response from your Board about whether these posters are inappropriate and if you are able to request they be removed by the business.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

No response received from advertiser.

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 objectifies women, uses sex to sell a product and features inappropriate language.

The Board reviewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser had not provided a response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.2 of the Code which 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 the confident pose of the woman and considered she was not represented in a manner which could be considered exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading and did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience”.

The Board considered that the use of this image on a poster outside the premises did mean that it is easily viewed by a broad audience. The Board considered however that it is reasonable for the advertiser to advertise their product on their premises and noted that the location of the Grosvenor Hotel in Brisbane city would mean it is less likely to be viewed by children.

The Board considered that while the advertisement does depict a woman wearing a cropped top which enhances her bosom and exposes her midriff, the image does not expose any inappropriate parts of the woman. The Board noted that the pose of the model is mildly sexually suggestive but not to the point that would make it unacceptable for a broad audience.

The Board determined that whilst the advertisement was mildly sexualised, it 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 2.4 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.5 of the Code. Section 2.5 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall only use language which is appropriate in the circumstances and strong or obscene language shall be avoided.”

The Board noted the advertisement features the words, “Best Buns” and considered that in conjunction with an image of a hot dog bun this language is not inappropriate.

The Board noted that the phrase at the top of the poster, “C U Next Tuesday” can be used as a reference to the ‘c’ word however the Board considered that most members of the community would be unlikely to understand this reference and that due to its relatively obscure use, those who did understand it would be unlikely to be offended by it.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not use strong or obscene language and determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.5 of the Code.

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

