



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

AdStandards.com.au

Advertising Standards Bureau Limited
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1	Case Number	0356/18
2	Advertiser	Essential Beauty Franchising
3	Product	Beauty Salon
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	08/08/2018
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features Olympic athlete and AFL women's league recruit Becchara Palmer talking about her hair removal regime and endorsing the services of Essential Beauty.

THE COMPLAINT

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

The ad appears to have sexist themes and double standards that are undermining gender equality. The Olympic athlete says her beauty routine was essential when representing Australia in beach volleyball, and even more so now she plays in the AFL Women's league. How is her beauty routine relevant to being a role model for girls and women in sport??? I don't see similar ads with male athletes talking about their beauty routines...

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE





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

Complaint reference # 0356/18

It is with great regret that this commercial has been cause for complaint. One of the reasons we opted to use Becchara Palmer in our advertising was to promote the sense of empowerment that Bec emulates to all women as gender equality and self-respect are two of the core principles held dear by all at Essential Beauty.

Description of the ad:

Becchara Palmer, Olympic athlete and AFL women's league recruit talks about her hair removal regime and endorses the services of Essential Beauty

Comments

The author questions how Becchara's beauty routine is relevant to being a role model for girls and women in sport. Although Becchara probably is considered a role model by many, including men and women of all ages, at no point did we state this in the ad.

In addition, the author comments that they do not see similar ads with male athletes talking about their beauty routines.

We cannot comment on the accuracy of this statement as we do not know exactly how other companies are marketing their product. However, we fail to see the relevance of this.

In no way is the ad designed to demean or vilify women. In fact, the opposite is intended. Becchara is a regular user of all Essential Beauty services and her comments are 100% based on her own opinions and experiences. Becchara endorses Essential Beauty as a woman and as an athlete.

The areas you asked us to address:

Discrimination or vilification – none evident in this ad

Exploitative or degrading – not applicable

Violence – none whatsoever

Sex, sexuality and nudity – none whatsoever

Language – all totally appropriate. No swearing, blasphemy or inappropriate innuendo.

Health and Safety – not applicable

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

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 sexist and shows a female athlete talking about her beauty routine while at the Olympics, which is irrelevant to her sporting career.

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

The Panel noted that this television advertisement features Olympic athlete and AFL women's league recruit Becchara Palmer talking about her hair removal regime and endorsing the services of Essential Beauty.

The Panel considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.1 of the Code which requires that 'advertisements shall not portray or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual preference, religion, disability, mental illness or political belief.'

The Panel noted the Practice Note to Section 2.1 of the Code which provides the following definitions:

"Discrimination – unfair or less favourable treatment
Vilification – humiliates, intimidates, incites hatred, contempt or ridicule".

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement is sexist and that the spokeswoman's beauty routine is unrelated to her sporting achievements.

The Panel considered the advertiser's response that the advertisement does not present the spokeswoman as a role model as the complainant suggest, she is presented as a consumer of the product and details her own opinions and experiences.

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that they have not seen similar advertisements showing male athletes talking about their beauty routines. The Panel noted that it considers the content of the advertisement in question only, and not hypothetical scenarios where a situation may be reversed, or why a situation is not reversed.

The Panel considered that associating hair removal by a female with her sport is not objectifying or discriminatory. The Panel noted that while some members of the community may see hair removal as unnecessary, or an unnecessary link to a successful sporting athlete, the content of the advertisement itself does not breach



the Code.

The Panel considered that comments made in the advertisement are the testimonial of one person and not reflective of women as a whole. The Panel considered that most members of the community would not consider that the woman in the advertisement is speaking on behalf of all women.

The Panel considered that associating hair removal by a female with her sport is not objectifying or discriminatory. The Panel noted that while some members of the community may see hair removal as unnecessary, or an unnecessary link to a successful sporting athlete, the content of the advertisement itself does not breach the Code.

The Panel determined that the advertisement did not discriminate against or vilify a person or section of the community on account of gender, and did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

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

