



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	0096/19
2	Advertiser	Amanda Johnston Body Waxing and Tanning Specialist
3	Product	Beauty Salon
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Poster
5	Date of Determination	03/04/2019
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This poster advertisement features a woman naked from the waist up with her arm covering her breasts.

THE COMPLAINT

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

This photo of a naked woman is completely inappropriate to be displayed on this shopfront in such a public place, in the presence of young children often walking past and driving past in cars. I request that this photographic image be removed from the public view. Thank you

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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





I wish to advise that I have been operating my beauty business at this address for the past seven and a half years and up until now have never had any concern or issues regarding my tasteful shop front.

My intention has never been to offend anyone or to degrade woman. As two of the main components of my business are, Body Waxing & Spray Tanning, I purposefully sort out the best imagine to tastefully reflect these services. This imagine does not expose any genitalia.

As I am a professional beauty therapist, it is imperative that I reflect nothing but the highest of ethical standards.

I eagerly await your reply.

THE DETERMINATION

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the Panel) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the image of the woman in the advertisement is inappropriate for display in a public place.

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

The Panel 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 Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement depicted sexualised content.

The Panel noted that this poster advertisement was in the front window of a store, and considered that the relevant audience for this poster would be broad and would include children.

The Panel considered that the model is well covered and considered that the advertisement does not depict nudity. The Panel noted that the model is well-endowed, however considered that the depiction of a larger busted woman was not of itself a depiction of sexualised imagery.

The Panel noted that whilst the advertisement uses a naked woman, her pose was not overtly sexualised, sexually suggestive or provocative. The Panel considered that in the context of the beauty business being advertised, the image was treated with sensitivity.



The Panel considered that the image was not overly sexualised, and considered that the imagery included in a front window of a beauty business that is visible to members of the community is not sexually explicit and does not depict nudity.

In the Panel's view the advertisement did treat the issue of sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant broad audience and 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 Panel dismissed the complaint.

