



**ADVERTISING  
STANDARDS  
BUREAU**

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

# Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0393/13</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Australbricks</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>House Goods Services</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>Print</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>27/11/2013</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

## ISSUES RAISED

2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement features two pictures of the model, Alyssa Sutherland, stood next to brick walls built using AustralBricks. The text above her reads, "Looking gorgeous is only half the job" and the text below explains how it is important to be able to last the distance and remain looking good when you are a model and that this is what AustralBricks do best: "their good looks are 100% Australian and 100% natural. And like Alyssa, their beauty goes way beyond skin deep".

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*It is a clear case of objectification of women - totally outrageous and offensive, particularly bad since they seem to imply that women who can "last the distance" are better than women who age over time.*

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

*The Advertiser did not provide a response.*

## **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 is objectifying in its comparison of women to bricks and suggestion that women who can last the distance are better than those who age over time.

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

The Board 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 Board noted that the advertisement features an image of a model, Alyssa Sutherland, and the headline, “Looking gorgeous is only half the job” followed by text which explains how models need to be able to last the distance just as bricks need to be good looking and last a long time.

The Board noted the complainant’s concerns that the advertisement suggests women who last the distance are better than those who age over time. The Board considered that this interpretation of the advertisement is unlikely to be shared by the broader community as the text is clear that lasting the distance as a woman is in the context of modelling and that there is a clear relation made between a model having to look good for her job and Australbricks also having to look good.

The Board noted that the advertisement does not suggest that women who look good are better than those who don’t age as well and considered that the advertisement is not discriminatory towards women based on their age.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

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 complainant’s concerns that the advertisement objectifies women. The Board noted that the model used in the advertisement is clothed and is posing in a manner which is consistent with a fashion pose. The Board considered that the advertisement does not objectify women or use sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading to women.

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

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

dismissed the complaint.