



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 :	0311-21
2. Advertiser :	Honey Birdette
3. Product :	Lingerie
4. Type of Advertisement/Media :	TV - Out of Home
5. Date of Determination	10-Nov-2021
6. DETERMINATION :	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.4 Sex/sexuality/nudity
AANA Code of Ethics\2.2 Exploitative or Degrading

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This advertisement depicts group of people walking down a street. The image is titled George. Visible clothing on individuals includes:

- a black strapless shirt and black skirt
- black underpants and black translucent bra with nipple pasties
- black boy leg underpants and black strappy bra with breast cut-outs and nipple pasties
- red bra and black skirt.

THE COMPLAINT

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

The woman in the foreground is topless; she is bent forward, making her breasts a focal point- this is classic objectification. The ad is part of a broader campaign called "So kinky" which can be viewed at the URL provided in the ad. Note that the full video is pornographic and contains strong bondage/so called "kink" themes - completely unsuitable for the general audience it has been advertised to. When did this advertiser obtain the right to expose children in our communities to bondage-kink-porn ads, and when will the ad system change to stop it from doing so? These ads are harmful to women and children. It is reprehensible that this serial ad offender and handmaiden of the global porn industry is given free rein to continue advertising in this way.



THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Advertiser did not provide a response.

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 advertisement is objectifying women and too sexualised to be displayed in a location where children can view it.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser did not respond.

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

The Panel noted the AANA Practice Note which provides guidance on the meaning of the terms exploitative and degrading:

Exploitative - (a) taking advantage of the sexual appeal of a person, or group of people, by depicting them as objects or commodities; or (b) focussing on their body parts where this bears no direct relevance to the product or service being advertised.
Degrading – lowering in character or quality a person or group of people.

Does the advertisement use sexual appeal?

The Panel noted that this advertisement contains imagery of a women in lingerie and sexualised costumes and considered that images of women in lingerie do contain sexual appeal.

Does the advertisement use sexual appeal in a manner that is exploitative?

The Panel noted that the advertisement was for a lingerie product, and it was reasonable for the women to be depicted wearing that product in the advertisement. The Panel considered that while the women are wearing lingerie the focus of the advertisement is not irrelevantly on their body or body parts but rather on the context of a group of women on the street on their way to a costume party or event.



The Panel noted that the women are posed in a manner suggesting that they are having fun and are on their way somewhere, and there is no suggestion that the women are objects or commodities.

The Panel considered that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative of the women.

Does the advertisement use sexual appeal in a manner that is degrading?

The Panel considered that the depiction of the women was relevant to the promotion of lingerie and this did not lower the women in character or quality

The Panel considered that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is degrading to the women.

Section 2.2 conclusion

Finding that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative or degrading of an individual or group of people, the Panel determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

Section 2.4: Advertising shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Panel noted the Practice Note for the Code states:

“Overtly sexual images are not appropriate in outdoor advertising or shop front windows.

“Although not exhaustive, the following may be considered to be overtly sexual:

- *Poses suggestive of sexual position: parting of legs, hand placed on or near genitals in a manner which draws attention to the region;*
- *People depicted in sheer lingerie or clothing where a large amount of buttocks, female breasts, pubic mound or genital regions can be seen; The use of paraphernalia such as whips and handcuffs, particularly in combination with images of people in lingerie, undressed or in poses suggestive of sexual position;*
- *Suggestive undressing, such as pulling down a bra strap or underpants; or*
- *Interaction between two or more people which is highly suggestive of sexualised activity.*

“Discreet portrayal of nudity and sexuality in an appropriate context (eg advertisements for toiletries and underwear) is generally permitted but note the application of the relevant audience. More care should be taken in outdoor media than magazines, for example.



“Images of models in bikinis or underwear are permitted, however, unacceptable images could include those where a model is in a suggestively sexual pose, where underwear is being pulled up or down (by the model or another person), or where there is clear sexual innuendo from the ad (e.g. depicting women as sexual objects).”

Does the advertisement contain sex?

The Panel considered whether the advertisement contained sex. The Panel noted the definition of sex in the Practice Note is “sexual intercourse; person or persons engaged in sexually stimulating behaviour”.

The Panel considered that the women are not engaging in sexual intercourse in the image or interacting with each other in a sexualised manner. The Panel considered that the advertisement did not contain sex.

Does the advertisement contain sexuality?

The Panel noted the definition of sexuality in the Practice Note is “the capacity to experience and express sexual desire; the recognition or emphasis of sexual matters”.

The Panel noted the advertisement featured women in lingerie and revealing costumes. The Panel considered that the advertisement contained sexuality.

Does the advertisement contain nudity?

The Panel noted that the definition of nudity in the Practice Note is “the depiction of a person without clothing or covering; partial or suggested nudity may also be considered nudity”.

The Panel noted that the advertised product is lingerie and the women are portrayed wearing the products. In particular the Panel noted the costumes of the women at the front left and back right of the image and that their breasts were mostly exposed with their nipples covered by pasties. The Panel noted that the advertisement contained partial nudity.

Are the issues of sexuality and nudity treated with sensitivity to the relevant audience?

The Panel noted that the definition of sensitivity in the Practice Note is “understanding and awareness to the needs and emotions of others”.

The Panel considered that the requirement to consider whether sexual suggestion is ‘sensitive to the relevant audience’ requires 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 Panel noted that this image appears in store windows and considered that the relevant audience includes retail workers, people shopping in the Honey Birdette store and people who are not shopping at Honey Birdette but who are walking past the store, and that this last group would include children.

The Panel considered that the image featured a number of women and there was no particular focus on any of the women or their body parts. The Panel considered that while they were dressed in a sexualised manner, the context of the advertisement was more in line with women heading to a costume party than engaging in sexual behaviour.

The Panel noted that two of the women's breasts were exposed however noted that their nipples were covered in pasties. The Panel noted that the overall scene was similar to what would be seen at Mardi Gras or at news coverage of a similar event, and that these types of images were not overtly sexual.

The Panel considered that the sexualised nature of the advertisement came from the products being advertised and that the women's poses and the context of the advertisement were not overtly sexual. The Panel considered that it is reasonable for an advertiser to feature their products in an advertisement, so long as the depiction of those products is not overtly sexual.

The Panel noted that the advertisement was set at night and the colours were dark and muted and the advertisement would not attract the particular attention of children.

Overall, the Panel considered that the image was not overtly sexual or inappropriate for use in a setting where a broad audience would view the advertisement.

Section 2.4 Conclusion

The Panel determined the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

Conclusion

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