Case Report

Case number: 0235-26
Advertiser: Ghanda Clothing
Medium: Website
Decision date: 23-Sep-2026
Decision: No breach

ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE COMMUNITY PANEL

- AANA Code of Ethics - 2.2 Exploitative or Degrading - no breach
- AANA Code of Ethics - 2.4 Sex/sexuality/nudity - no breach

AD DESCRIPTION

This website ad promotes the advertiser's 'Cassie Bikini'. It includes nine images of female models posing in the bikini. Four images were taken by the poolside, and five appear to have been taken indoors. The 'PRODUCT DETAILS' section reads, 'Designed for your most relaxed, sun-kissed days, our Cassie Bikini is laid-back perfection. This triangle bikini top offers small coverage with a comfy halter neck and adjustable ties for your perfect fit. The matching super cheeky bottoms also feature adjustable straps, all finished with a subtle contrast trim and ties for that effortlessly cool look.

- Halter neck
- Triangle bikini
- Top - Small coverage
- Bottom - Super cheeky coverage with adjustable straps
- Contrast trim and ties'






SUMMARY

Complaint

A complaint was received on the grounds that the ad features models posing in a sexually provocative way. The complainant argued that the advertiser's audience is children under the age of 18.

Advertiser response

The advertiser did not submit a response to this complaint.

Decisions

The Panel found that the ad did not breach Section 2.2 of the AANA Code of Ethics, as the ad did not feature sexual appeal in a manner that was exploitative or degrading.

The Panel also found that the ad did not breach Section 2.4 of the AANA Code of Ethics, as the ad did not depict sex, sexuality or nudity in a manner that would be considered insensitive to the relevant audience.

ASSESSMENT AND DECISIONS

Section 2.2 (AANA Code of Ethics): Advertising shall not employ sexual appeal:

(a) where images of Minors, or people who appear to be Minors, are used; or

(b) in a manner which is exploitative or degrading of any individual or group of people

The Practice Note defines 'exploitative' and 'degrading' as follows:

> **Exploitative** (a) taking advantage of the sexual appeal of a person, or group of people, by depicting them as objects or commodities; or (b) focusing 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 persons
>
> Treating humans as sexual objects or commodities for sale perpetuates the harmful view that people, particularly women and girls, are evaluated based on their appearance and risks the premature sexualization of children.

The Practice note adds:

> In advertisements where minors, or people who appear to be minors, are used, sexual appeal is harmful, not acceptable and will always be regarded as exploitative or degrading. Advertisements must not include sexual imagery, state or imply that minors, or people who appear to be minors, are sexual beings or that ownership or enjoyment of the advertised product will enhance their sexuality. Minors, or people who appear to be minors, must not be portrayed in a manner which treats them as objects of sexual appeal. Advertising featuring someone who appears to be a minor in a pose which indicates they are trying to appear alluring has been found to breach this section of the Code.
>
> Material can be found to be exploitative or degrading even where the model is looking confident where the model is being depicted as a product or commodity or the focus on

body parts is not relevant to the product or service being advertised. Advertising which used sexual appeal and suggests that a person is a product, or that they exist only for the enjoyment of others has been found to breach this section of the Code. Likewise, advertising which uses attractive models in revealing clothing, where the use of the model is not relevant to the product, has been found to be exploitative.

Panel assessment

The Panel considered that it was likely uncommon to see female models pose with their legs spread as is done in this ad. However, the Panel considered that this does not automatically imply sexual appeal.

The Panel considered that the ad promotes swimwear, and that people who lounge around the pool are likely to be sitting or lying in a relaxed manner, and would not likely behave as they would in, for instance, and office environment or formal event.

The Panel considered that the ad did not feature close-up shots of inappropriate parts of the model's anatomy and did not appear to present the model as a commodity or suggest that she was only present for the enjoyment of others. The Panel accepted that the model appeared young but was not concerned that the model appeared to be a minor.

As such, the Panel considered that the model did not appear in a degrading or exploitative manner.

Panel decision

Accordingly, the Panel found that the ad did not breach Section 2.2 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

Section 2.4 (AANA Code of Ethics): Advertising shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Practice Note defines 'sex', 'sexuality' and 'nudity' as follows:

> **Sex:** Sexual intercourse; person or persons engaged in sexually stimulating behaviour.
>
> **Sexuality:** The capacity to experience and express sexual desire; the recognition or emphasis of sexual matters.
>
> **Nudity:** The depiction of a person without clothing or covering; partial or suggested nudity may also be considered nudity.

Panel assessment

The Panel considered that the ad did not depict or reference sexual intercourse or people engaged in sexually stimulating behaviour. The Panel further considered that the ad did not depict or suggest an expression of or recognition of sexual matters or desires. Accordingly, the Panel considered that the ad did not depict sex or sexuality.

The Panel considered that the models shown were wearing the advertised bikini and were therefore dressed in a way that could be considered partial nudity.

The question, therefore, was whether the ad treated issues around partial nudity with appropriate sensitivity to the relevant audience.

In this regard, the Panel acknowledged that the advertiser's brand and clothing likely attracts a large following among younger audiences, teens and pre-teens. Considering that the advertiser sells swimwear, the Panel considered that it was not inappropriate to depict models in such swimwear.

The Panel considered that the imagery did not carry sexual connotations and depicted scenes that would be common at swimming pools or beaches. While the Panel again considered that the spread-legged poses might be considered an odd choice for female models, this related more to individual views on morality and gendered behaviour than it related to nudity.

Given the context in which the swimwear was modelled, the Panel considered that the ad treated issues around nudity with appropriate sensitivity to its relevant audience.

Panel decision

On this basis, the Panel found that the ad did not breach section 2.4 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Panel found that the ad did not breach any other section of the relevant advertising codes.