



Case Report

1	Case Number	0304/13
2	Advertiser	Bonds Industries Ltd
3	Product	Lingerie
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	11/09/2013
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement for Bonds lacies features five woman dancing in a circle. They are wearing lace undies and are holding lace parasols.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Disgusting and demoralizing to girls and women. Selling sex and porn. It objectifies women and the way the the underwear is advertised is inappropriate especially for the time slot. It is soft porn. There should not be extreme close ups of women's bottoms as they are exercising and other close ups and cutesy smiles at the camera. The ad makes the women look under age in their immature behaviour. If Bonds wanted to advertise underwear then it would not use super slim, overly happy, very young women jumping around, because you can advertise underwear in many ways and not necessarily in a soft porn style. It effectively is contributing to all the other ads displayed everywhere which push this idea that women should not be visible unless extremely young and statistically improbably thin. This is unreal expectation on women and children are especially vulnerable. Trust me I do know how this affects young girls as I was anorexic for years chasing this perceived ideal. Ads like this hurt people. They should not be shown. It is completely inappropriate. Men will get off on it. It is not just an ad.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

No response was received from the 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 complainants' concerns that the advertisement is objectifying and demeaning to women in its depiction of skimpily clad women dancing in a sexualised manner, is selling porn, suggests the women are underage, promotes anorexia and is not appropriate for viewing by children.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code 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 advertisement features woman dancing in their underwear and considered that it was reasonable for an advertiser to depict its products being modelled in its advertising. The Board noted that whilst there were some close up views of the underwear the Board considered that these images were to highlight the product rather than the woman and did not focus on the women's bottoms or breasts in a way that highlighted the women's bodies rather than the underwear.

The Board noted the complainants' concerns that the women in the advertisement appear to be underage. The Board noted the Practice Note to the Code of Ethics which states, "In advertisements where images of children are used, sexual appeal is not acceptable and will always be regarded as exploitative and degrading".

The Board considered that the women in the advertisement all look over the age of 18 years and considered that the advertisement did not feature underage girls and did not breach the Practice Note for Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

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 we see women dancing in underwear. The Board considered that the dancing was not sexualised and that the close up of the underwear in these, and in other, scenes was a focus on the underwear and not a sexually suggestive focus on the women’s bodies.

The Board noted that all the models used in the advertisement are wearing Bonds underwear and that the overall tone is fun and innocent rather than sexually suggestive. The Board noted that some people may prefer not to see images of young women dancing in underwear but considered that the content of the advertisement was not sexually suggestive and was not inappropriate for the potentially broad viewing audience which could include children.

The Board determined that the advertisement 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 considered Section 2.6 of the Code. Section 2.6 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety”.

The Board noted the complainant’s concerns that the advertisement promotes anorexia in young girls and considered that all the women in the advertisement appear to be of a healthy body size for lingerie models. The Board considered that the advertisement did not depict under-weight women and did not encourage women to try and be under-weight.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.6 of the Code.

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