



**ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BUREAU**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph (02) 6173 1500 | Fax (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1	Case Number	0018/14
2	Advertiser	Good Time Burgers
3	Product	Food / Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Print
5	Date of Determination	12/02/2014
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Image of a woman's bottom wearing ripped denim shorts. The word "Goodtime" can be seen on her right buttock cheek through a rip in the material. The text below is written in the form of a formal apology for any offensive taken at the previous Goodtime Burgers' advertisement which was printed in The Beast magazine.

THE COMPLAINT

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

The advertisement is degrading to women as the text (taken together with the image of the half-naked bottom) clearly suggests that women are comparable to pieces of meat, and are faceless sexual objects to be consumed. This implication is heightened by the words 'moist and juicy', which have associations with women's genitals and which are apparently being compared to meat. The sarcastic tone of the text reinforces the message that women are not to be respected and that the advertiser does not respect the dignity of women, or their right to be offended by degrading images.

This advertisement appeared in a free magazine that is widely distributed in cafes, letterboxes and other public places, and which are visible to all members of the public, including children.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Advertiser did not respond.

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 complainant’s concerns that the advertisement suggests women are comparable to pieces of meat and that they are faceless sexual objects to be consumed. The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s response.

The Board noted that this advertisement has been placed in response to an advertisement for the same advertiser which was upheld by the Board in case 0416/13 and which featured a woman lying on the beach with a burger between her buttocks.

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 that the advertisement features a woman’s behind in a pair of denim shorts that are torn and frayed. Underneath the image is an apology from the company for a previous advertisement which appeared in the same magazine. The Board noted that the image appeared in the Beast magazine (a monthly magazine distributed to the beaches of Sydney’s East).

The Board noted that the shorts on the woman are very short and that her legs are slightly apart. The Board noted that on the left cheek of the woman’s behind, there is a cut out portion that is designed to look like a burger. On the right cheek is the name of the company “Goodtime.” The Board noted that the image is designed to catch the eye of the reader by the use of the woman’s behind.

The Board noted that the text below the image is intended as a humorous response to the previous decision of the Board to uphold complaints regarding a print advertisement that depicted a woman’s bottom as a burger with the ingredients of the burger inserted between her bottom cheeks (ref: 0416/13).

The Board noted that the text in conjunction with the image gives a humorous context which in the Board’s view did not amount to an image which is exploitative and degrading and that

it did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board then 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 the image itself does not expose the woman’s genitals and that although her shorts are brief, she is covered by them. The Board considered that the image was mildly sexualised but that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience”.

Based on the above, the Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

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