



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

AdStandards.com.au

Ad Standards Limited
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1. Case Number :	0248-19
2. Advertiser :	Yum Restaurants International
3. Product :	Food/Bev Groceries
4. Type of Advertisement/Media :	TV - Pay
5. Date of Determination	7-Aug-2019
6. DETERMINATION :	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.4 Sex/sexuality/nudity

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This Pay TV advertisement features a couple in disagreement with each other. The woman turns around and exclaims: "I've been faking it!" and walks out of the room. The flatmates gasp and look at each other awkwardly. We hear the front door slam shut as the main character realises his flatmates have witnessed their private exchange. He says awkwardly, "Did someone say KFC?". He and his friends are seen enjoying KFC.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Well this ad runs unchecked in family viewing time and my grandsons wanted me to explain what it was about. The ad has obvious sexual connotations and should not be in childrens viewing time when we are trying to have a fun afternoon watching the football with the kids . May possibly be ok for after 9.00 pm

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE





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

Description of Advertisement

The Advertisement to which the Complainant refers to is a Pay TV advert for the KFC brand and the Hot Rods product (Advertisement). The Advertisement is targeted at adults and will be advertised until 5 August 2019.

We open on a muffled discussion, where a couple are in disagreement with each other. The woman turns around and exclaims: "I'VE BEEN FAKING IT!" and walks out of the room. The flatmates gasp and look at each other awkwardly. We hear the front door slam shut as the main character realises his flatmates have witnessed their private exchange. He says awkwardly, "Did someone say KFC?". We cut to him and his flatmates enjoying Hot Rods with wild abandon.

The complaints and relevant codes

The Complainants have expressed concern that the Advertisement depicts domestic violence and the use of inappropriate language portraying sexual innuendo.

The following concerns are cited in the complaints:

AANA Code of Ethics\2.4 Sex/sexuality/nudity\S/S/N - general

No Sex, sexuality or nudity (Section 2.4)

KFC is of the view that the Advertisement does not depict or treat sex without sensitivity to the relevant audience which is adults.

Although this Pay TV advertisement plays on a common area of awkwardness between couples, it is not sexually explicit. It does not use words, action, or behaviours that depict sex, sexuality, or nudity.

KFC also adheres to the Responsible Children's Marketing Initiative (RCMI) and the Quick Service Restaurant Initiative for Responsible Advertising and Marketing to Children (QSRI) guidelines. KFC commits to not advertise food products to children or during shows where the audience demographic of children exceeds 35%. This applies to all KFC TV campaigns regardless of the messaging.

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

With respect to other sections of the Code of Ethics, I note that the Advertisement:

Does not vilify or discriminate people within the specified groups (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); only uses language which is appropriate in the circumstances (including appropriate for the relevant audience and medium) with no use of strong or obscene language (section 2.5); does not depict any material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety (section 2.6); and the Advertisement is clearly distinguishable as an advert and uses KFC branding to that effect (section 2.7). Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, KFC believes that the Advertisement complies with sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the Code of Ethics.

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 complainants' concerns that the advertisement has obvious sexual connotations and should not be in children's viewing times.

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

The Panel noted that the television advertisement features a couple in disagreement with each other. The woman turns around and exclaims: "I've been faking it!" and walks out of the room. The flatmates gasp and look at each other awkwardly. The main character realises his flatmates have witnessed the exchange and he says awkwardly, "Did someone say KFC?". He and his friends are seen enjoying KFC.

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 considered whether the advertisement contained sex, sexuality or nudity.

The Panel considered that all the people in the advertisement were clothed in normal everyday attire and that the advertisement did not contain nudity.

The Panel considered whether the advertisement contained sex. The Panel noted the dictionary definition of sex most relevant to this section of the Code of Ethics is 'sexual intercourse; sexually stimulating or suggestive behaviour.' (Macquarie Dictionary 2006).

The Panel noted the reference to 'faking it' and considered that while it was suggestive of past sexual behaviour it was not a description of or depiction of sex.



The Panel considered whether the advertisement contained sexuality. The Panel noted the definition of sexuality includes 'sexual character, the physical fact of being either male or female; The state or fact of being heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual; sexual preference or orientation; one's capacity to experience and express sexual desire; the recognition or emphasising of sexual matters'. The Panel noted that the use of male or female actors in an advertisement is not of itself a depiction of sexuality.

The Panel considered that a reference to past sexual behaviour could be considered a recognition or emphasis of sexual matters and that the advertisement did contain sexuality.

The Panel then considered whether the advertisement treated the issue of sexuality with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Panel considered the meaning of 'sensitive' and noted that the definition of sensitive in this context can be explained as indicating that 'if you are sensitive to other people's needs, problems, or feelings, you show understanding and awareness of them.'

(<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/sensitive>)

The Panel noted that the requirement to consider whether sexual suggestion is 'sensitive to the relevant audience' is a concept requiring them to consider who the relevant audience is and to have an understanding of how they might react to or feel about the advertisement – the concept of how subtle sexual suggestions is or might be is relevant to the Panel considering how children, and other sections of the community, might consider the advertisement.

The Panel noted the complainants' concern that these advertisements had played during the football, and that the sexual connotations should not be in children's viewing times.

The Panel noted that the relevant audience for this advertisement would be broad, and would likely include children.

The Panel considered that while most adults would understand the phrase 'faking it' to be a sexualised term, this is not a concept young children would be familiar with. The Panel considered that the phrase is not sexually explicit and can be easily explained as her having faked liking him or something else. The Panel considered that teenagers and adults who understood the reference as sexual would be unlikely to find the reference confronting.

The Panel considered that the sexual reference in this context did treat the issue of sexuality with sensitivity to the relevant broad audience.



The Panel considered that this advertisement did treat the issue of sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant broad audience and did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach any other section of the Code the Panel dismissed the complaint.